

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

JULY, 1880.

ART. I.—THE CHARACTER OF CICERO.

1. *Cicero's Correspondence, arranged in Chronological Order*; with a Revision of the Text, a Commentary and Introductory Essay on the Life of Cicero and the Style of his Letters. By R. Y. TYRRELL, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, and Professor of Latin in the University of Dublin; Editor of the *Bacchæ* of Euripides. Vol. I. Dublin: Hodges, Foster and Figgis. London: Longmans. 1879.
2. *The Life of Marcus Tullius Cicero*. By WILLIAM FORSYTH, M.A., Q.C. Second edition. London: J. Murray. 1867.
3. *An Account of the Life and Letters of Cicero*. Translated from the German of B. R. ABEKEN. Edited by CHARLES MERIVALE, B.D. London: Longmans. 1854.
4. *The Letters of Cicero to Atticus*. Book I., with Notes and an Essay on the Character of the Author. Edited by ALFRED PRETOR, M.A., Fellow of St. Catherine's College, Cambridge. Cambridge. 1873.
5. *The Formation of Christendom*. Part First. By T. W. ALLIES. London: Longmans. 1865.

TO propose for discussion the character of Cicero after the world has been talking of him for more than twice the period he looked forward to, when anxiously anticipating the judgment of posterity, may seem, at least to readers who are content to live in ignorance of the past, a pedantic and old-fashioned amusement. For all that, it seems to have a new and real interest for some of the foremost minds of our age, as is plain from the list of authors and scholars which we place at the head of this Paper. In truth, if a review of a character so remarkable as that of Cicero fail to attract thinkers

of intelligence, the fault lies in the limited knowledge or discrimination of the writer, not in the importance of the subject. Were it in itself much less striking than it is, the varying medium through which each age perceives it, ought to bring out new lights, practically innumerable. Such a creation as a human mind, and one of the greatest the world has seen, cannot be less rich in the results it yields to the observer than the meanest of the works of Nature. We pause, perhaps, too long on a needless apology, and as in a previous Paper we attempted to analyse the character of another and the greatest of Romans, we now proceed to study that of Marcus Tullius Cicero.

Observers on Cicero's character are commonly copious upon two principal faults, vanity and vacillation, which indeed often go together. The older writers seem to have been struck by his mocking, sarcastic spirit. A recent critic has almost with personal bitterness charged him with want of principle.

We shall, further on, consider these and other questions in detail; but for the sake of order, and because of the succession in which the phenomena of character develop themselves, we propose to examine, first the intellectual aspects of his mind, then the moral, under which also the political will range themselves, and finally the religious, with which as yet political ideas were almost indissolubly united.

A man's intellectual character may be judged of, partly from the biography of his mind, the story of its development; partly from his mental achievements, but perhaps still more from what he constantly reverts to, from the pet objects worshipped in the inner sanctuary of his intellect rather than from those which practically he places before him as his public aim. Often he is greatly mistaken in the choice of these, but they still show his character, and even the more strongly so for that very reason. Of the grand general aim of the mind of Cicero, there can be no doubt; it was to attain to civil greatness by the only means by which at Rome in his day it could be reached, and that was eloquence. As often happens, the means itself became rapidly an end, and had there been no consulate to win, he would still have placed before him as his ideal excellence, the perfection of the faculty of public speaking. It was not that physically he seems to have peculiarly qualified for this attainment; on the contrary, like Demosthenes, he originally laboured under defects that might have discouraged any ordinary ambition, a shrill, badly modulated voice, and a weak chest, but there was that fire in him which difficulties, far from quenching, only kindle to greater energy. Whatever may have been his infirmity of purpose in other things, at least there was none in the choice of his end, and of the means to it, the

absence of which clearness of perception causes so many highly-endowed minds to miss their true destiny. There is a story that the future orator was told by the oracle of Delphi to make his own nature and not the opinions of others, his guide through life. So far as regarded the training of his genius, this advice was faithfully followed. Placing then eloquence before him as his proximate end, his elevated intellect also made him clearly discern the important principle that consummate excellence is not to be attained without an *idea* being constantly before the mind, that is, without the continual presence in the imagination of a degree of perfection as the object of aspiration, which it is known beforehand can never actually be realized. This is what he calls the "*aliquid immensum, infinitumque.*" This it is which distinguishes genius from mere talent, which the painter, the poet, the sculptor, the architect, every creative artist must have before him, and which the lower, practical, though still highly useful and commendable working capability can seldom conceive. We say seldom, because there is something of this wherever very great excellence, in whatever grade, is found. Obviously there is less room for it where things can be reduced to number, measure, and weight; but even there deep and thoughtful minds will imagine a conceivable perfection beyond what given materials can ever exhibit, as we see in the hypotheses of mathematicians assuming a perfectly straight line, or a perfectly rigid body. To return to Cicero. His mind was filled with this idea of perfection; it haunted him day and night. But as a principle of self-education, this alone would be too exalted and too distant, though anything but vague or uncertain. To bring down the idea so as to make it an instrument of practice, it is necessary also to have before us the most perfect imitations of that idea. In painting, the works of the best artists showed even a Reynolds that there were achievements of art that might otherwise have seemed impossible. Mere beautiful imitations of the beauty of Nature, itself but an image of the unapproachable majesty of the Infinite and Unseen, give hints of the way of seeing truth, and of conveying it to the eyes and the minds of those who are either less gifted or have less patiently thought out what is possible for man to do.

The realized type which Cicero had placed before his mind at an early age, was the orator Crassus, as exhibited in a famous speech of his for the Servilian Law of Cæpio. This choice determined the character of his own eloquence, much as that of Demosthenes was decided by a similar admiration, at the beginning of his career, for the speech of the orator Callistratus in a dispute between the Athenians and Oropians; but doubtless the models differed as much as the two great developments

which they set in motion. Of eloquence there are in fact two leading classes, and, in a certain point of view, there cannot be more than two. One is that in which matter predominates, the other in which the main object is form. In the one the orator persuades, in the other he excites admiration and delight; the one is all business, the other all display; the one is argument and emotion as tending to action, the other expression and imagination as tending to a high mental gratification. Of both these classes the youthful Cicero had either witnessed, or knew by recent and living tradition excellent specimens in the two great orators of the generation before him, Antonius, and Crassus whom we have just mentioned. He appreciated both with equal truth and intensity, but the natural bias of his mind led him to give the preference, for his own purposes, to the latter. It was a preference that perhaps had been encouraged by many a friendly dispute in days of youth, with his brother Quintus, who took the other side, and each has been admirably set forth by Marcus himself in the splendid dialogue *De Oratore*. His favourite methods of oratorical study, as delivered in the person of Crassus, are such as to fall in with this view, and principally inculcate incessant use of the pen, artificial cultivation of the memory, and very extensive reading in all kinds of literature that form the taste and judgment, poetry, history, and philosophy. This habit of mind would alone be sufficient to make his eloquence characterized rather by display than by practical power, and so to render it less useful as a model for the parliamentary and forensic orator than might be expected from his name. We say less useful, but it does not follow because a great artist is not free from certain faults, or even mistaken principles, that the study of him may not give many a hint even to those who adopt a manner quite different from his. It is *suggestive*, and that which is suggested may be so widely different from the suggesting object, that the connection might quite escape an ordinary observer. To mention one thing, which is somewhat inconsistent with the prevailing idea about Cicero's vanity. The extraordinary finish which is apparent even to the most superficial reader, for example, in the Verrine orations, that splendour and lustre of diction, over and above and surpassing even mere beauty of language, which the words seem to give out by their choice and collocation, is a result which shows rather the reverse of vanity; which shows the artist forgetting himself, first in the interest and attention he bestows on his work, secondly in the respect which he pays to his audience who are to judge it. This is a point which conceited and idle speakers and writers are very apt to forget. With a little practice, it is an easy thing to speak fluently for

an hour, or to write a column or two of showy declamation. But more pains would be given to the business, if the composers had more deference to the opinions of those before whom it will come. True it is, that few of the latter are educated ; it is also true that still fewer could themselves pretend to speak or to write. But a thinker like Cicero, and Aristotle before him, knew that the uneducated are far from deficient in critical power, and that a defect either in taste or in reasoning is as little likely to escape them, as a defect in conduct on the part of men who set up more or less for goodness escapes those who are anything but good themselves. And accordingly, Cicero places this truth among the foremost considerations which one who is endeavouring to make himself an orator ought to have upon his mind. He remarks, in the person of Crassus :

It is a great task and office, for a man to undertake and profess that he alone in a great assembly, when all are silent, is to be listened to on the most important subjects. For there is hardly a man present who does not see the faults of the speaker more sharply and keenly, than he does the passages that are free from fault. Any blunder, therefore, overwhelms even the parts that deserve praise.—*De Orat.* I. § 116.

Consistently, therefore, with this just and strong impression of the power even of a vulgar audience to perceive faults in speaking and reasoning, he describes Crassus and elsewhere himself also, as turning pale in the commencement of a speech, and quivering in every limb. This timidity, far from being ashamed of, he regards as inevitable in proportion to the perfection of the orator in his art ; and if it be absent, the speaker, he thinks, deserves the charge of impudence ; the best speaker is also the one who most dreads the difficulty of speaking and the various events a speech may have in its course, and the expectation which men have formed of him. In this spirit of humility, which ever accompanies high genius, we find him not wholly discouraging from the attempt at public speaking even those who seem not very well adapted by Nature for it, and mentions cases where a moderate proficiency in the art was of considerable use, as far as it went, in the attainment of that civil eminence to which every Roman citizen of any mark would be tempted to aspire.

The vice of ancient oratory consisted principally in its tendency to pass off into the processes of praise and blame, panegyric and invective, as opposed to the office of proving or persuading. This inclination is natural in proportion as States lose their freedom ; and although this latter reason does not apply to most of the eloquence of Cicero, yet still he was formed in the schools of Greece during the period of their decline—not

in the great days of Pericles or of Demosthenes, but in times when the lecture-rooms of Rhodes or Athens had taken the place of the Pnyx or the Agora in training the aspirant to oratorical honour. The contrast accordingly is great between the masculine force of the speeches of Demosthenes and the verbal splendour of those of Cicero. Where Cicero is most at home, is in such a speech as that for the Manilian Law on the one hand, or in personal attacks like those on Catiline and Antonius on the other. In the former his highly-cultivated mind enables him to set forth in the most finished language what the ideal commander ought to be, and to exhibit Pompeius as its realization. In the latter, whilst no doubt there is abundance of personal animosity, there is still an absence of deep passion; there is not often that grandeur which we find even in the almost malignant fury of Demosthenes against Æschines, but the prevailing idea is still that of the great rhetorical artist mixing his colours, and simulating a greater intensity than he really feels. A proof of this is the difficulty which we conceive almost every reader must find in sympathizing with these attacks, a difficulty which certainly no competent student would ever complain of, when he applies himself to enter into the oration *De Corona*, or even the more subdued energy of that against Midias. Compared with these, the invectives of Cicero, with all their artistic power, wear an appearance of womanish spite, nay, of the "yelping pertinacity" which Hawkins so unjustly attributed to Pitt. He is more successful, at least to the judgment of a modern reader, in his sarcastic attacks of a lower degree of energy, such for example as his ridicule of the claim of Cæcilius to conduct the impeachment of Verres, where he can show the playfulness of genius, and the consciousness of immense professional superiority.

Cicero cannot be called, either in oratory or in philosophy, a powerful reasoner. He shows, indeed, in the former, the skilfulness which belongs to the mere advocate, and which was more readily tolerated by ancient than it is by modern, at least by English tribunals, in drawing off the mind of the audience from the real point at issue; of which the oration for Milo affords an example; but when there is occasion for a sustained search into political causes, for instance in discussing the construction and condition of the Catilinarian party, we do not see much evidence of the statesmanlike mind.

The view taken is but one on the surface; it exhibits nothing of that "winding into the subject like a serpent" which Goldsmith thought characteristic of Burke. We could hardly find a parallel in Cicero to the breadth and power of the picture Demosthenes gives of the political state of Greece before the

Peace of Philocrates; nor, among modern orators to the grasp and sweep of thought which makes a speaker like Gladstone, amidst a whole assembly of able men, remind us of Teiresias among the shades.

οὐκ πεπνύσθαι τοὶ δὲ σκαὶ αἰσποῦσιν.

Hom. Od. X. 495.

It is perfectly true that oratorical reasonings are not like those which belong either to the mathematician or metaphysician. In oratory it is even a fault to go too deep or ascend too high; still in proportion as a speaker approximates to the ideal, he will be able to carry even inferior minds with him through trains of reasoning, and upwards to principles at first sight far beyond their powers of appreciation.

Whilst the rhetorical mind more or less incapacitates a thinker for deep investigation, and tends to weaken his love of truth, it heightens his ability for acquiring the thoughts of others, and setting them forth in their oppositions and relations. Hence the value of Cicero as an historian of philosophy, which indeed might have been far greater than it is; still, with Diogenes Laertius and Plutarch, he has preserved for us a vast amount of information on the philosophical sects of Greece, which otherwise would have been swept away by the torrent of time, past the power of any drags to recover. By nature, by education and by choice, he belonged to the Academic school, which disclaimed the possibility of arriving at absolute truth, but set up probability in its place. He was therefore constantly led to balance opposite systems, and to hear and repeat what each could say for itself. His mind was not one that was drawn to the contemplation of universal and necessary truths; and on the other hand, even in the sphere of probabilities, it seems not to have been one that endeavoured by deep and patient thought, to ascend from probability to the moral certainty which is next to intuition or demonstration. Of science, in the modern acceptation of the word, he probably knew no more than every educated Roman of his day possessed; and he himself tells us that Roman education in this department did not go beyond mensuration and computation (*Tusc. Qu. 1, 2*). I cannot recal any trace of these studies in his writings, excepting the letter to Atticus, where he ridicules the optical disquisition of the architect Cyrus in relation to the windows of a bath-room. So too, of metaphysics, we find little in the voluminous literature which he created or interpreted. In the scholastic logic to which Aristotle gave birth, Cicero had undoubtedly been trained, as is abundantly proved by his being able to give, unassisted by his books, a copious abstract

of the *Topics*. But it had hardly disciplined his mind so as to make him a close and consecutive thinker. One of his latest works, the *De Officiis*, affords an instance in which logical rules, though correctly applied, are produced with a certain degree of parade which shows that he did not, to use an ancient illustration, avail himself so readily of the "close fist of dialectics" as he could of the "open hand" of the sister-art of rhetoric.

His definitions are not precise, nor deeply thought out; and his enumerations of the elements entering an idea are not the exhaustive catalogue one would find in Aristotle, but rather a series of thoughts suggesting themselves to a copious and able intellect which might be more or fewer without perceptibly affecting his argument. Hence, he does not excel when he attempts a systematized treatment of a subject as a whole; for example, the *Offices*, though, in other points of view, it would be absurd to detract from the merits of that admirable work, as a philosophical treatise fails almost in proportion as the author seems to lose hold of his Greek archetype, and passes off into the easy, common-sense, and practical conversation of the Roman gentleman, illustrated with a profusion of examples from Roman biography and history. In the latter, as everywhere, we remark the rhetorical character, for Cicero's historical anecdotes can never be quoted where accuracy as to fact is the object.

His mind was naturally led in the direction of prudential wisdom, which his consummate command of language enabled him to exhibit in forms that the refined intellect contemplates with a peculiar satisfaction and repose. It has perhaps been latterly too much the fashion to represent the form as everything with Cicero. But in truth, although the form is so beautiful that, quite independently of the matter, it would charm, still we need not look far in any department of his works to see that he conveys to us a wonderful amount of observation and experience, as might be expected from one who had had a range of life so varied, from the schools of Greece to the contentions of the forum and debates of the senate, and who had witnessed all the convulsions of the dying republic, from the dictatorship of Sylla to that of Cæsar.

In considering the writings of Cicero, there is this also to be observed, which lessens their value in one direction whilst it heightens them in another; I mean that one at least of the most considerable divisions of them, the philosophical, was put together, not simply for its own sake, but to supply an acknowledged want, or even to create a demand which as yet was hardly effective—to found a Roman philosophical litera-

ture. In a certain sense it was done to order, to meet the writer's own sense of what was wanting to the educated society of Rome. His task might be compared to that of the early Christian writers like Prudentius or St. Gregory Nazianzen, who sought to present their brethren with a literature of their own, when they were prohibited the use of that of the Pagan schools. Where such is the object, there must always be something artificial, something superficial in the result, although in no other instance has genius so succeeded in producing an imitation that may itself take rank as an original.

In his oratorical treatises, the later ones at least, he may be considered purely original, in the breadth and decision with which he removes the discussion of the subject from the confined circle of technical rules to which it had hitherto been limited, and in which for ages afterwards it continued to revolve, Quintilian alone excepted, to the free and attractive statement of the methods which a great genius had hit upon for his own cultivation, and the observations which a lifetime had given to his piercing penetration and tenacious memory. Almost equally original are his rapid but richly characteristic criticisms of the orators who had preceded him. It is true that the Greek literature in which he was bred had quite reached the critical stage, and we see in the writings of Dionysius of Halicarnassus something of the same spirit of criticism, but still that of Cicero is as native to himself as if he had never known any literature but Latin, and may be said to have anticipated even the most consummate style of literary notices known to the modern reviewer.

As to epistolary correspondence, where is there a rival to Cicero? Certainly not in Greek literature, which in this branch is quite singularly deficient, and its failure only made up here and there by ridiculous impostures, or by specimens such as some of those letters that go under the name of Plato, which modern criticism can but dubiously recognize. Pliny's letters are indeed overflowing with character and interest, but they are studied, pedantic and marked by mannerism and the taste of a degenerate age. Modern literature abounds in this department, and in some senses, for example the brilliant detail of Madame de Sévigné, and the high-bred ease of Chesterfield, it surpasses Cicero, but nowhere has there been combined, as in him, the practical knowledge of the statesman freely corresponding in politics, with the perfection of the great artist of style, writing extemporaneously. Distance of time tends to make all literature colourless, "*rebus nox abstulit atra colorem*," but colour is brought back if there be thrown over such remains the illustrations of learning and research. Even readers in-

adequately furnished with these means, may see standing out from many a page of Cicero's correspondence scenes, which a little imagination easily shows that to contemporaries they must have been picturesque in the highest degree. Sometimes we see him musing in solitude on the sea-shore, or, at home, teased with uncongenial minds; sometimes among his books with a roll of Dicæarchus gathering at his feet as he unfolds the scroll in his rapid reading; now, he tells with great satisfaction, how a *fête champêtre* he has given to the autocrat of the Roman world had passed off; again, an entertainment of a less ambitious kind at his brother's, marred by domestic *tiffs* which he had done his best to allay. Of the daily life of the Roman proconsul in a remote province we have at least so many traits given, that it needs no great addition to fill up the outline, and the student of Cicero's letters will perhaps learn more from them about it, than most moderns in private life can know of the corresponding manners in similar positions in the British Empire, from anything to be found in books about them.

We may further remark this in Cicero's intellectual character, that it betrayed, as he advanced in life, not a trace of the enfeebling action of age; on the contrary, his last years were marked not only by the variety and number of his literary productions, and the activity of his correspondence, but also by their unflagging, or even increasing, excellence, like the rich harvest or fruitage of a year which has been favoured in all its seasons. Again, in another respect his genius rose above what depresses so many aspirations—the lack of sympathizing minds around him. He but despised what he calls the *barbarorum inscitia*, and fell back to the society of the minds of past generations, kindred to, and exalted as his own. “*Quare incumbamus, O noster Tite (to quote his own glowing words), et ad illa præclara studia, unde discedere non oportuit aliquando revertamur.*”

On entering the subject of Cicero's moral character, taking the words in their largest acceptation, it may be remarked that this has necessarily been more or less touched upon in our review of his literary and intellectual, as well as his public character. We have seen it in his great leading aims, in the devotion and almost worship with which he pursued certain ideals, in the varied and yet identical type which was thrown off by his style in the literature which he created. This last, if anything can be, is a key to the moral nature of a man. It is an old observation, that we can read more of a man in his conversation than in his features; and this holds also of that conversation which by his books a great writer carries on with his own age and with all generations that succeed him. From

his works we can at least infer, that he was enthusiastic in his pursuit of a great object, that the ideas with which he was most conversant were exalted, refined and ennobling, that he had industry, patience, dispatch, kindliness, unselfishness, love of justice, and even courage, though not always reliable; that these virtues were chequered by self-esteem and by vacillation, however these faults have been exaggerated and caricatured by successions of writers who read Cicero but on the surface, by excessive depression when in adversity, by hardness and heartlessness where self-love—just self-love—had been wounded (as in his gratulations on the murder of Cæsar), by an unwise, thoughtless indulgence of a talent for invective and ridicule, shown in his reckless abuse of many an opponent, open as they might be to very severe condemnation, as Catilina, Verres, Clodius, Piso, and Antonius, in short, by much of that weakness which inferior minds are apt to welcome, because it seems to bring even the loftiest spirits to a lower level than their own. But if there is much of this to be seen in Cicero, let it be remembered, that we have a very large surface on which to observe it, and that it is the very greatness and amplitude of his character that has provided us with the means of detecting the very points which we are so ready to condemn.

To approach, however, those characteristics of him as a man, which we obtain in a less indirect manner: and first as to his moral purity. We need scarcely remark that on this head we expect little from any of the great men of antiquity, and that we cannot substantially take exception to the list of examples given in a powerful passage by Mr. Allies. It is not here our object, however, to state the favourable side of Pagan society, though we apprehend, that as compared with modern and even mediæval society, that is, with the *world* in both cases, the Pagan society has been rather too much blackened. Morality is part of the dictation of reason as well as of religion, and in all states of society there are some who obey reason more than others, some who are more out of the range of temptation than others. Our business for the moment is with Cicero. Middleton, for generations looked upon as the great authority for his biography, painted him as a sort of faultless monster, and this view was pretty generally accepted, his secret object, however, being, as De Quincey has well pointed out, to exhibit a perfect character, as having been formed independently of Christianity. Whether he is to be degraded to the level of many great names in antiquity as stained with their foulest sin, chiefly depends on the weight to be given to some verses in Pliny's epistles, describing an epigram attributed to Cicero, which, but for the wish to save so generally noble a character from such a dishonour

could hardly be viewed in any other light than passages of the same obvious colouring in the *Odes of Horace*. Even if this composition were falsely attributed to Cicero, the careless censure which he gives to the vice alluded to, in a passage of the *Offices* (I. 40), and again the easy indifference with which he makes a dignified interlocutor in the dialogue *De Natura Deorum* (I. 28) even acknowledge it, would be quite sufficient to prove that, at any rate, he was not in point of purity so much in advance of the society and age in which he moved, as the generally good and virtuous standard of his teaching and of his private life, on the whole, would have led us to expect.

Taking most of the private or domestic relations in which he was placed, we find in him not indeed anything very exalted, but much that in any period would be regarded as right-minded and loveable. His habit of mind was the very reverse of the false and extravagant patriotism proclaimed by the zealots of the first French revolution; it regarded primarily, the lesser country which belonged to a man's earliest associations, and advanced gradually from that to a wider but scarcely dearer citizenship. There are few things in ancient biography more pleasing than the often-recurring tenderness of Cicero for the home of his childhood among the Volscian mountains at Arpinum. His account of it can be appreciated by all on whom the provincial and county associations still familiar in England have a hold. "Quia si verum dicimus," he says, in explanation of this strong local attachment, "hæc est mea, et hujus fratris mei, germana patria, hinc enim orti stirpe antiquissima, hic patria, hic gens, hic majorum multa vestigia." "Because, truth to say, this is the real fatherland of myself and of my brother; for here we were born of an ancient stock, here is our country, here is our clan, here many a vestige of our ancestors." In the same spirit, he quotes the beautiful lines in which Ulysses in the *Odyssey* declares that, rough and rocky as his own Ithaca might be, it was a brave nurse of gallant youths, and that he knew not where he could see a sweeter spot. Personal allusions to his parents indeed are singularly rare in the works of Cicero, and not of remarkable interest.

Every student of Cicero will recal the curious announcement of his father's death in a letter to Atticus, which has appeared to most readers so heartless; briefly giving the date of the event, and passing off to another subject: "Pater nobis decessit," &c. But it has been ingeniously and ably shown by Professor Tyrrell, that in point of fact these few words do imply an affectionateness which only escapes those who have omitted to notice the force of the ethical dative *nobis*. To bring out that force, we should render "Our dear father died;" "We lost our

dear father," or the like—an excellent example of the value of thorough scholarship as auxiliary to the material knowledge of facts. But even were it not so, little inference could safely be drawn from an isolated passage like this, when we do not possess the other side of the correspondence. As a husband, up to a certain point in his life, Cicero appears in a pleasing and amiable light, as one of the many examples in Roman biography which show that, in spite of the prevailing corruption of morals and laxity of social ties, there was still conjugal happiness to be found. But the storms which, as he reached the decline of life, swept with such fury over the political world of Rome, indirectly brought with them disquiet and strife into the family circle also; and when confidence was once disturbed, in the midst of domestic troubles, the fatal facility of divorce offered too simple a remedy to be foregone even by such sanctity as the marriage-bond theoretically had, and by the recollection of the common interests, joys and sorrows of many years. We find in fact, Cicero in his sixty-second year separating from the wife of his youth, and marrying a girl of whom he might have been the grandfather; and next year divorcing the newly-married wife of his old age because of a wretched, if true, suspicion, that she was only too glad at the death of his daughter Tullia.

The mention of Tullia leads us to speak of the parental feelings in the mind of Cicero. They were strong, and manifested in a remarkable manner, as well towards his daughter as his son. Nothing can be more natural and simple than the allusions to them in his letters during their childish years—for example, when the great statesman, in the midst of his political correspondence, *duns* Atticus for a promised gift that the little Tullia was teasing for; or, in the case of the youthful Marcus, with a father's pride—perceiving the sympathy with party which a boy is apt to show at a very early age, he says that the boy is "a thorough aristocrat." His affection for his daughter was beautiful, and his grief for her early death is one of those passages which have ever since been held in recollection among the memorable examples of those deep feelings in which the great and the lowly mind is alike human. The picture is no doubt greatly heightened by the truly remarkable letter of sympathy in which Sulpicius ministered to the sorrowing father whatever comfort Paganism or philosophy could give.

The light in which the fatherly character is shown in Cicero towards his son Marcus, is as pleasing as anything of the kind which antiquity can present. He gives him the best education he knew of, and writes a treatise for his moral

guidance which still remains, side by side with books like Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, or Arrian's *Epicetetus*, as valuable even in our day, both for their practical good sense and as showing the prevailing coincidence of human reason with the moral code of revelation, and instructive even where they exemplify human reason, unaided, in its weakness and its errors. We may venture without hesitation to say that the heathen moralists show to advantage when compared with those in Christian ages who have attempted the same task without the faith, as for example, Lord Chesterfield in his *Letters to his Son*.

That Cicero was capable of deep and noble friendship, his correspondence would amply indicate, and his dialogue *De Amicitia*, furnishes a back-ground to it, full of interest, as showing the generous ideal on which it was based. He has indeed been lately attacked in no measured terms for showing, as is alleged, much indifference and selfishness in his "Letters to Atticus," full as they are of himself, and telling us little of the affairs of his correspondent. We doubt if this is much of a criterion. The confidence reposed in a friend surely shows friendship, and the man who was led politically to throw himself away in his final hazard, very much, if not mainly from a sense of his obligations and regard for a friend whose faults he saw but too clearly, was not likely to have been wanting in real interest for one with whom he came into still more intimate contact. Scarcely a public man ever lived, as far as we can judge, to whom his friends had more ready recourse for valuable introductions than Cicero, or one who was more willing to use his purse and influence to do them kindnesses great and small.

As for fraternal affection, perhaps a more passionate expression of it, under wounded feelings, is hardly to be found in any literature than that addressed in his exile to his brother Quintus (*Ad Q. Fr.* I. 3) beginning: "*Mi frater, Mi frater, Mi frater*, tunc id veritus es, ne ego iracundia aliqua adductus pueros ad te sine literis miserim? aut etiam ne te videre noluerim? Ego tibi irascerer? tibi ego possem irasci?"

To form an estimate of Cicero's character as a statesman, it is of course important in the first place to have before us a clear idea of the attributes of a statesman, and then to consider how far our subject can be said to have possessed them. It will be agreed that a statesman should have large views of a political situation, and be able practically to realize them; should have the power of commanding, and also of managing mankind, as well by word as by action; should have his country's interests at heart, be thoroughly master of them;

should be incorruptible and unselfish; should be decisive and consistent, yet forbearing, and stand at a high elevation of character above the multitude, have well-grounded self-respect, and the absence of all littleness.

That Cicero possessed some of these qualities in a high degree, is certainly witnessed by the marked figure he made in his times, by the position he attained to, and what is far more, which, after many vicissitudes, he regained for a time. And if the opinion of the most clear-sighted of judges may be quoted, I need only mention that Julius Cæsar compared him, in his eloquence and his conduct, to Pericles and Theramenes; of whom he could not have named a more commanding mind than the first, or a more adroit and sagacious mind than the second. This authority alone ought to outweigh many an attack that has been made upon Cicero by *littérateurs* in all ages. Authority, however, should be supported or illustrated by reference to facts. Probably Cæsar may have discovered a parallel to Pericles, in the exalted personal position which Cicero held in the greatest period of his life, but particularly in his forcing, by mere power of eloquence, the people to acquiesce in some of his political views, when their prejudices, passions, and even interests went the other way; for example, in throwing out the agrarian law of Rullus, and carrying the law of Otho, which assigned reserved seats in the theatre to the knights. The latter unquestionably left an enduring mark on Roman society, lasting even far into the times of the empire. The resemblance to Theramenes might indeed be meant ironically, to compare the rapid changes which in him were due to his quick perception of wind and tide in politics, with those which were attributed in Cicero to infirmity of purpose and vacillation. But rather perhaps seriously to Cicero's equally great insight into character, which, however, those defects rendered so fatally useless to him.

The conduct of Cicero in the affairs of the Clodian prosecution, on which Mr. Pretor chiefly relies in proof that Cicero was unprincipled as a politician, would constitute a serious parallel to Theramenes, if we accepted Mr. Pretor's view. But it appears scarcely made out. Mr. Pretor says that "having set this in motion he is alarmed the next moment at the probable consequences." Is there proof that he did set it in motion? and did he not use all his eloquence against the Clodian side, till he saw that the optimate party could not be depended on in the business? Then certainly Cicero admits that he began to yield, however vehement his actions had been at the beginning of the struggle. He gave up the contest when Hortensius brought in a bill constituting the court in such a

manner as to make Clodius's acquittal certain. When a statesman of his respectability adopted such a policy, it seems improbable that a bold speech of Cicero's could at the moment, as Mr. Pretor supposes, have altered his own future and perhaps that of Rome. He may have been wavering, irresolute, deficient in *coup d'œil* and in grasp of a political situation, which defect the whole tone of his mind, both as philosopher and as advocate, would deepen; but to pronounce him unprincipled, especially when in the end he was ruined by adherence to the very party which he adopted in commencing his career, seems too harsh and sweeping a judgment.

It is unnecessary to comment on the admitted prudence and energy which he showed in the suppression of the Catilinarian conspiracy, which nevertheless wears rather the look, which agrees with a possibly authentic tradition, of unseen influences exercised on him, whether that of the masculine and domineering mind of his wife Terentia, or the mystic suggestions of that singular and little-noticed character, the Pythagorean Nigidius Figulus. The execution of the conspirators was an instance of false energy, for which Cicero afterwards paid dear—and resembled too much the violent, coarse, and cruel policy which we so often notice in the proceedings of the aristocratical or optimate party. On the whole, opinions are divided about this strange phenomenon, the Catilinarian conspiracy. Professor Tyrrell, in his very able and interesting essay, compares it to the Gunpowder Plot, and inveighs against the *stupidity* of Catiline. I feel unable to go along with this view, although the results and the whole course of the action do not seem to bear out the notion of that impossible or demoniac kind of genius which has been almost always attributed to the great conspirator. On the other hand, it is certain that the only two fragments by which we can safely judge of what Catiline was as a speaker (the comparison of the senate and people to bodies strong and weak, the one with a head, the other headless, and another striking passage alluded to in Cicero's oration *Pro Murena*, c. 25) show great fire and energy. To return, however, to Cicero; much management and also much of that breadth of action which leads men to make sweeping sacrifices for great objects, is seen in his winning his colleague C. Antonius by relinquishing in his favour the province of Macedonia. There unquestionably was no want of personal courage in this period of his life. The apparent lack of it at a much later time, when his heart failed him in presence of the martial array that surrounded Pompeius' tribunal at the trial of Clodius, was complicated with that nervousness which is invariably felt in commencing a speech, and for which he offers so interesting and

just an explanation in the person of Crassus in the first book of the *De Oratore*. That he could sway masses of mankind, as on many great occasions, and what is harder, an individual of commanding power, as Julius Cæsar, when he pleaded before him for Ligarius, is not a proof of the statesman's force of character, but of the orator's, which is very different. The Verrine trial exhibited great powers of dispatch of business, and of decisiveness, but here, too, these qualities were manifested in the person of the great advocate. He had very great and extensive knowledge of mankind, great command also of practical information, such as belongs to the political economist; witness all he says of the produce of corn in Sicily, and the well-known anecdote of his minute acquaintance with estates throughout Italy. As the governor of a province, he showed himself to be a masterly administrator, and also a kind and considerate ruler; which, in days when Rome, whatever she became later, was as yet little better in regard to her subjects than modern Turkey, showed him far beyond his age. Under the test of great political misfortune he certainly broke down. The fall from power, which Burke, in his hyperbolic language, has said "canonizes and sanctifies a great character," reduced Cicero to feeble, hysterical lamentations. He could neither bear exile with that high-minded and far-seeing spirit which made Demosthenes turn it into opportunities of important action, or Alcibiades and Bolingbroke into clever, however unprincipled, intriguing. In the strife and whirlpool of impending change under the first triumvirate and later, he seemed indeed to hold the balance of politics, and to be courted by all, but it was rather as a man representing cultivation, and looked up to by all for exceptional genius, than as in himself a political power. The proposals of Cæsar and his friends to him show this in their tone, which is but the kinder and more flattering side of the view which, in early life, had styled him "Greekling and a pedant." Equally unfavourable to an estimate of him as a great statesman is the tone, blunt and commanding-officer-like, of Pompeius' notes to him as the struggle was drawing near its crisis. And at that time and later, only special pleading can save him from the charge of extreme and humiliating vacillation. He was moved by the instincts of his nature, which made him feel his real place was with the optimate party, whilst his reason and observation made him see that their success could only have been a repetition of the horrors of the *régime* of Sylla. His life for months was a kind of seesaw between these opposite motives. He was himself too elevated to bow to Cæsar's genius like Balbus or Oppius; and he had tasted too early the enjoyment of well-earned

greatness in a free state to be the courtier of an autocrat, like the literati of the next generation, or to know his place as the servant of the crown, like Agricola (in another department) in days of still more hateful despotism.

There was indeed a brief period after the murder of Cæsar, when the activity of Cicero seemed to be a central power amidst the strife of party, and his position at that time was the more extraordinary, considering that it was a kind of rejuvenescence, and of restoration after a great eclipse. But it happens rarely indeed that such phases in a statesman's life are really efficient, as, for example, were the last days of Thiers. He could not helm the ship when he had to deal with the rough, passionate nature of Antonius and the precocious craft of Octavius, as he had dealt (if a view already alluded to be right) with the stupidity of a Catiline. He was therefore sucked helplessly into the vortex, but in his last moments displayed a grandeur of courage and self-possession which may match with some of the sternest displays of that quality among the heroes of Roman history. On the whole, however, remembering that he himself is the chief witness we have of his weakness, and that to read the letters to Atticus is like reading a diary never intended for publication, which reveals countless struggles the world never saw, and many they never suspected, we must agree with Augustus, who, musing over a book of Cicero's his grandson had attempted to hide from him, exclaimed: "My child, that was a great man!" I have mentioned Julius Cæsar's opinion. Among moderns whose judgment must be regarded as the most competent, the admiration so ardently expressed by Niebuhr (who, by the way, remarks that Cicero's "proper calling was that of a statesman, and not of a scholar") may well balance the scorn with which the name and actions of Cicero are treated by Mommsen.

Passing on to the religious character of Cicero, I would first, for the sake of clearness, state what the religious mind, which (so far as it belongs to natural temperament) may be found in the heathen as in the Christian, appears to consist in. The following are its principal marks:—reverence for the Unseen and the supernatural; disposition to make the most of any hints or arguments for the supernatural; readiness of belief in apparently divine manifestations; constant reference of action to a divine power, in short to Almighty God, in whatever degree, and with whatever admixture of error the mind has been enabled to approach Him; above all, fear of offending Him. That heathens could have these feelings in some considerable measure we need hardly endeavour to prove: Socrates, Cleanthes, Seneca, Epictetus, will occur to any reader who

cares about these studies. The question is, whether Cicero had a religious mind, or the elements of a religious mind, in this sense? I am afraid the answer must be rather in the negative, though I should not put it so strongly as Mr. Allies has done, who seems to me to lay too much stress on the marked paucity of allusions to duties towards the gods in the *Offices*, and on the view taken in that treatise of their nature in relation to that of man. To begin with some things that are least familiar, though most on the surface—that is, traces of a purely personal and biographical nature collected from his most familiar writings—I do not think that more than four or five indications can be found amidst all this material, to show that Cicero had the mental characteristics I have noted. Such as they are, I would mention

(1) A rather remarkable passage from his *Letters to Atticus* (vii. 1), where he says: "I entreat you—so may all good luck attend you!—apply all your affection and prudence to study my situation. For I think I see before me such a conflict as I never had hitherto, unless *the same God who delivered me better than I could have dared to hope for*, from the Parthian War, casts a look upon the republic."

(2) A reference in the 2nd epistle of the same book to a statue of the goddess Minerva he had set up in the Capitol is worth noticing as expressing the kind of religiosity which clung to a Roman scholar and statesman like Cicero, even when they had in words thrown aside all the popular belief: "Were all these things otherwise," he says, "still that Guardian of the city of whom you write, would oblige me to remember her noble inscription, and would never permit me to imitate Volcatius or Servius, but would have me both feel and stand up for something worthy of myself." Here, deep in the decline of Paganism, the idea of Minerva plays the same part in his mind that it does in characters like Achilles and Ulysses in Homer.

(3) The request to his wife that she would, according to her wont, render due thanksgiving to whatever god it was that he thought must have been the cause of a very sudden relief he had experienced in sickness, shows that the sense of dependence on the Unseen and supernatural was not so foreign to the mind of Cicero as might be imagined. A single passage like this testifies to much more. At the same time, as I have seen it somewhere remarked, he dismisses what may be called the business of religion to the hands of his wife, as perhaps too many do, who ought to know better, in a very different religion.

(4) His design, repeatedly alluded to, though at last dropped,

of deifying his daughter Tullia, so far at least as a private individual could do so, and raising a temple to her worship, is again, I think, not wholly to be ignored as a proof of what should not be classed as *ficta religio* (to use the division in Valerius Maximus); that is, false as it was in itself, and almost unintelligible till we obtain his point of view, it was in him a real desire to place before himself the continued existence which he attributed to her among the gods.

It may be said that, if this is all, it is very little, and certainly, in the midst of a sea of troubles, each letter almost in the later books to Atticus, representing a wave of it, we can scarcely, or not at all, recognize even the shadow of taking refuge in the idea of an all-wise and beneficent Being from Whom comes all good, and all sorrow too that is not in itself evil. He incessantly allows carking care to devour his spirit, indulges to the utmost an anxious, fretting, many-sided, scrupulous imagination, and makes no real effort to grasp the shadowy aid that even philosophy could give him. Only literature helps him somehow to cheat his cares for the hour or the day, but religion, so far as these letters go, scarce ever.

A rather better account might be drawn of him under this head, from a general view of his ethical, theological (so to call them), and oratorical writings. That in his principal practical treatise reference to the gods holds so small a place, is perhaps not more significant than the same reticence, in Aristotle's *Ethics*. Both treatises are eminently human, and we must consider the purpose for which they are written; besides, that in general, inferences drawn from *silence* are among the most precarious that we can make. However, this must be borne in mind: (1) that the *pietas* and *sanctitas* by which the gods above and below were supposed to be conciliated, was mainly external, but (2), that he held the gods loved nothing so much as the creation of states and cities and their orderly administration. Hence, in furthering the greatness of his state, the Roman statesman conceived that he was serving and pleasing his gods, regarding undoubtedly his gods as beings like himself, and with similar tastes, though indefinitely more powerful.

It would be unfair to deny, that in the theological treatises of Cicero the argument at least from design is as ably worked out as perhaps any modern writer has presented it, and that he shows a deep sense of admiration and awe at the wisdom and providence displayed in the natural universe. Beyond this he does not ascend; nor again does he seem to have been at all drawn to the more elevated and ideal imaginations of moral goodness which were presented in the Stoic philosophy. Readers not familiar with these studies must, in reading the *Offices*,

have been embarrassed by the slight and superficial manner in which he mentions the *recte factum* his authorities had studiously contrasted with the mere *officium*, the ordinary action fulfilled from the lower level of the life of a good citizen. It would take us too long to discuss the difference between these; suffice it to say, that the former presents an analogy, but only an analogy, to saintliness; that is, that both the one and the other had its source merely in nature, without the least infusion of the supernatural, which, in point of fact, was not attributed even to the gods.

As Greek and Roman Paganism in general regarded the divine as one and the same with nature, their ideas of divine interference and revelation are mostly conversant with natural phenomena of the rarer sort. A rather curious summary of these is given in Cicero's abstract of Aristotle's *Topics*, addressed to Trebatius. He says:

Divine testimonies are mostly as follows: First, of speech [*orationis*], for oracles were so called from the very fact, that in them is contained the speech of the gods: then of things, in which there are as it were certain divine works: first, the universe itself, and all its order and furniture; then the flights and songs of birds in the air; next, scunds and fires in the same air, and various prodigies in the earth: a foreknowledge too has been discovered by means of the entrails in sacrifices. Many things too have been signified by the visions seen in sleep, from which topics the testimonies of the gods are sometimes alleged to establish proofs.—*Topica*, § 77.

The first-named of these would require an article to itself, and its connection with Cicero, though very remarkable, is limited to his consultation at Delphi already mentioned; the second might be taken in a true acceptance, the argument from design being common to all religion, but its real character varies with the nature of the Being to whom the design is attributed. The rest are what we are more particularly concerned with here. Cicero, as an augur, could not but take a professional interest in them, as his very singular treatise on *Divination* shows. Personally, he regarded them with curiosity, and noticed some dreams which happened to himself and his brother in important crises of his life, almost with the indifference of an Epicurean, and in great contrast with the reverence and touching gratitude exhibited by Themistocles and Xenophon, in the case of similar supposed divine interferences in their favour.

Perhaps enough has been said in a Paper of this kind to give the ordinary reader some idea of the bearings of this part of the great orator's character; but it would be incomplete as well as unjust if I did not at least invite attention to the lofty,

noble, however vague imaginations of a world where he believed the most exalted spirits found a home when the turmoils of this life were over, best developed in the well-known fragment of *Scipio's Dream*. One thing may be further remarked: in his mind the alternative lay between happiness in the next world, and annihilation. A state of misery, even of just punishment, in the next world, he seems (in the *Tusculan Questions*, I. 5) to have been unable to bring his mind to contemplate seriously, even as a hypothesis; the mythical dress in which it was clothed by his religion, shocked his satirical and scoffing spirit; that sense of sin and weakness which, in many minds under heathenism, was a kind of supply or substitute for faith, being, to all appearance, singularly wanting in the mind of Cicero.

It is with a certain kind of dreariness that we quit the subject of the religious side of Cicero's character, remembering how much we owe to him, more than to any of his fellows, as well in the Latin language as an instrument of philosophical and even of theological thought, as in the material benefits of noble and refined culture, in his case with so little of the base admixture that degraded the bulk of heathen literature. It is best, perhaps, with the school of Clement of Alexandria, to consider heathen philosophy to a certain extent as the work of Providence, and to accept it as among the natural gifts that surround us, ministered by crowds, whether in so-called Christian countries or in the heathen lands of the present day, whose eternal destinies appear very dark, but of whom individually we cannot pronounce, whilst it is equally true that for all there was and is but one way to salvation, the Church of God that was from the beginning.

ROBERT ORNSBY, M.A.

ART. II. — THE GREEK CHURCH: ITS HISTORY, DOGMA, DISCIPLINE, RITES, ORGANIZATION, AND ITS FUTURE.

IN a former Article* we saw the obstacles opposed by Islamism to the growth and propagation of the different Eastern Christianities. The treaty of Berlin, by guaranteeing to all Christians indifferently, freedom of worship, access to public services and the right of property, has much ameliorated

* DUBLIN REVIEW, April, 1879, p. 397.

their condition in the Mussulman Empire. But other obstacles prevent the Eastern Churches from reviving and resuming their ancient splendour. The greater part of them remain, so far, separated from the Roman Church; error and schism have violently torn them from the centre of unity. They are branches separated from the trunk, and sapless; they are doomed, sooner or later, to perish. The deadly poison of error permeates, more and more, their dogmatic teaching; discipline grows relaxed, manners corrupt. There is one thing which ought greatly to facilitate the return of the Eastern Christians to the one fold of which St. Peter and his successors have been constituted heads by Jesus Christ himself; that is, their own ancient doctors, their own ancient rites, so full of majesty, the numerous and touching prayers of their liturgical Offices, which they preserve with a jealous attachment, and in which, if they would look closely, they would find the condemnation of their own errors, and the necessity of union with the See of Rome. The Sovereign Pontiffs, on their side, have neglected nothing to make union easy and lasting. They have continued to convert Oriental prelates their dignities and offices. They have always urged the preservation of the Eastern rites, and have forbidden, in most precise terms, abandonment or modification of them in anything whatever, excepting the correction of abuses that had crept in, and the reforming of what was contrary to faith, hurtful to souls, or destructive of union itself. For some years past a Union has been promoted between Anglicanism, the "Old-Catholicism" of Germany, and the Eastern Schism. The attempts have been fruitless, and justly so. For Anglicanism is also a branch cut off from the sap-bearing trunk of the Catholic Church, and "Old-Catholicism," which has been still more recently separated, sufficiently shows, by its self-imposed title of "Old," that it draws near the tomb, as, furthermore, everything appears to indicate. There is for all these Churches one only means of again flourishing—to unite themselves with the centre of unity at Rome. There is their future; otherwise, sooner or later, they will die out, in indifference or in still more modern errors: the detached branch can have only one history—it lives awhile by its own sap, then it languishes, is dried up, and perishes. What we shall now say concerning the Greek Church will show that the salvation of that Church which rules over the vast regions of Russia and Turkey lies in its union with the Roman Catholic Church; its history, its liturgical books, its doctors, the saints whom it worships, all proclaim this on every side. It takes all the obstinacy of heresy, and all the ignorance of the masses, to keep the eyes closed to a truth which grows every day more patent, according as the history and monuments of the Russian

Church are better known, and the schism of Photius and Michael Cerularius more carefully studied.

1. *The Greek Schism : Photius.*

The Greek Church, with its principal See at Constantinople, the capital of the Eastern Empire, was, up to the ninth century, united to the Roman Church in a community of belief and in obedience to the Roman Pontiff, but with different rites and with a discipline of its own. Then appeared a man of illustrious birth, allied to royal blood, versed in all the sciences of his time, an orator and poet; of marvellous activity and consummate ability, of easy access, trained to business, but ambitious, full of cunning and dissimulation, quick to lay hold of circumstances and turn them to his own profit, recoiling from no means in order to arrive at his aim. Such was Photius, the first author of the Greek Schism. It is necessary to know his history. Cardinal Hergenröther has published it, in our time, in a learned work.* Private secretary of the Eastern Emperor Michael III., and commander of the guard, from being a simple layman, Photius became, in six days, Patriarch of Constantinople. It was under the following circumstances:—The See of Constantinople was at that time held by a holy patriarch named Ignatius, and the imperial throne by a young man, Michael III., who governed under the wise tutelage of his mother, the Empress Theodora. Michael had an uncle named Bardas, an ambitious man, of abandoned morals, living incestuously with his step-daughter. At the instigation of Bardas, Michael shook off the tutelage of his mother, and banished her, with his sisters, to a monastery, where he wished to force her to take the veil. Bardas thus became all-powerful in the Empire. He hated Ignatius, who had reproved his dissolute manners, and had, on Epiphany Day, refused him communion because of his incestuous connexion. As Ignatius refused to give the veil to Theodora against her will, Bardas seized the opportunity to gratify his hatred of him. He made out the Patriarch to be a seditious man, who was in league with Theodora in a conspiracy. The artifice succeeded. Ignatius was condemned unheard, driven from his see, and exiled (23rd November, 857). A month later (25th December), Photius took possession of the patriarchal throne—against all right, since Ignatius had not abdicated. A bishop, who had

* "Photius, Patriarch von Constantinopel, sein Leben, seine Schriften und das Griechische schisma." Regensburg, 1867. 3 vols. The works of Photius have been edited by Migne, "Patrol. Græca," tom. ci.-civ.

been deposed for crimes, had, contrary to all canons,* conferred upon him all the sacred orders, including the Episcopate. To legitimize this sacrilegious usurpation there was a pretence of election, and Photius declared, in writing, that he would be only the coadjutor of Ignatius. But soon, feeling himself strong in the support of the Emperor and Bardas, he threw aside the mask. The bishops who remained faithful to the legitimate Patriarch, assembled together in the church of St. Irene, and declared Photius intruded and excommunicated. He, on his side, assembled his partisans, bishops, priests, and laics in a Conciliabulum in the church of the Holy Apostles, and pushed audacity so far as to depose and excommunicate Ignatius.† This Synod lasted until the autumn of 858. Meanwhile Photius had busied himself in making friends and placing his adherents on episcopal thrones. To silence the many voices raised on all sides against the usurpation, Photius and Bardas felt that they must get the Sovereign Pontiff on their side. Hitherto, in fact, the Pope of Rome had been recognised as supreme Head of the Church. He had presided, by his legates, at the General Councils held at Constantinople, at Ephesus, at Nicæa, at Chalcedon: more than once he had with his supreme ruling interfered in the affairs of the patriarchate of New Rome. Photius, therefore, wrote to Pope Nicholas a lying letter in which he dared to affirm that Ignatius had abdicated voluntarily by reason of age, and that he was living retired and honoured in a monastery.

I cannot (he added) express the sorrow which fills my soul when I see myself charged with the weight of the episcopate. But the assembled metropolitans, all the clergy and the people, moved by I know not what strange impulse, unanimously shouted my name as soon as my predecessor had renounced his dignity. Without heeding my excuses and earnest entreaties, they imposed on me the episcopal charge; they did violence to me and carried their own wish in spite of my tears and sorrow.‡

* Not only did the canons of Councils prohibit any ordination without observance of the *interstitia*, but even the Justinian Code itself. See "Can. Apost.," 80; "Sardic." 10; "Cod. Justinian," "Nov." 123, c. 1, § 2. The intrusion of Photius was therefore illegitimate: 1, because the see was not vacant; 2, because his ordination was against the canons; 3, because he was ordained by a bishop deposed, and consequently without legitimate power: he had thus incurred the penalty of suspension.

† Congregavit concilium et una cum sequacibus suis depositis et damnatis, excommunicatis et anathematizatis, et aliis sine sedibus, atque cum his a quibus vel ille irregulariter et illicite provectus fuerat, vel quos ipse temere ac indebite provexerat, contra Ignatium depositionem facere et anathema dicere ausus est. Nicol. I., Ep. 7.

‡ Epist. I. ad Nicolaum Papam. Migne, "Patrol. Gr.," cii. 58, sqq. The pseudo-patriarch wrote similar letters to the patriarchal Churches of the East.

These hypocritical protestations were sent to the Sovereign Pontiff by an ambassador of Michael III. and four Greek bishops. The Emperor, on his side, affirmed the same things, and added that troubles had arisen on this occasion, and that the Iconoclast party threatened to be revived. Consequently he prayed the Sovereign Pontiff to send thither legates who would pacify men's minds. To make the imposition the more successful, the embassy carried to the Pope presents of unheard-of magnificence.

Neither hypocrisy, nor lies, nor presents succeeded in seducing the Sovereign Pontiff. He refused to ratify the irregular ordination of Photius; but he consented to send two legates to Constantinople to examine the facts of the case.

We have (he wrote a little later to the Emperor*) enjoined on our legates to confine themselves to an examination of the cause of Ignatius, who has been driven from his church without having been accused by any one, and to sending an exact report to us. In the interval, it is our conviction that the consecration of Photius cannot be admitted: consequently, we have commanded our legates not to communicate with him frequently and readily. 'For,' as says the great Pope Leo in his letter to Flavian, 'we, who desire that the judgments of priests should be maturely discussed, cannot, without knowledge of the cause, pass a judgment prejudicial to one of the parties; it is necessary, first of all, that we know exactly the whole affair.' We have only authorized them to regulate whatever justice and piety shall demand in the question of the images of our Lord Jesus Christ, of his holy Mother the Virgin Mary, and of the Saints.

The legates were bearers of two letters, one for the Emperor, and one for Photius. In his letter to the Emperor the Sovereign Pontiff complains that, contrary to the rule traced by the Fathers, Ignatius had been deposed and Photius consecrated without the consent of the Holy See.† In his letter to Photius he praises the profession of faith made by Photius, but he blames the irregularity of his ordination; nevertheless he will recognise him as Patriarch, if it can be done after the report of his legates. After their arrival at Constantinople the legates, first placed in confinement during a hundred days, then threatened with prison and exile by the Emperor, and corrupted by presents from Photius, betrayed their trust. They took part in the deposition of Ignatius in a Council of 318 bishops whom

* Nicolai I., Epist., 8.

† "Ad ejus, sicut ipsi scitis, integritatem observationis, multoties conventus factus fuerit sanctorum Patrum, a quibus et deliberatum ac observatum extitit, qualiter absque Romanæ Sedis Romanique Pontificis consensu nullus insurgentis deliberationis terminus daretur." S. Nicolai, Epist., 2.

Photius and Bardas had seduced. The holy Patriarch was led before the Council, despoiled of his sacerdotal ornaments, was pronounced unworthy, and then imprisoned; but, in spite of menaces and tortures, he refused to abdicate, and he persisted in his appeal to the Apostolic See. In this Council Photius gave a signal specimen of his bad faith by effacing, in a phrase of the Pope's letter ("*without* the consent of the Roman Pontiff"), the word *without*, and substituting *with*, thus making the Pope say the contrary to what he actually wrote.*

The legates returned to Rome with an ambassador from Michael, who carried letters of Photius to deceive the Pope. When he had read the acts of the Synod, the Sovereign Pontiff perceived at once that the legates had been unfaithful, and he loudly disavowed them, protesting against all that they had done. On March 28, 862, he addressed an encyclical letter to all the Churches of the East,† in which he declares: "We do not admit Photius, and we do not condemn Ignatius. We do not rank, and we will not rank, Ignatius amongst deposed Patriarchs, as we do not count, and will not count, Photius in the number of bishops." He repeats the same thing in writing to the Emperor.‡ His letter to Photius is more severe.§ After refuting the reasons given by the usurper, the supreme Pontiff ends by interdicting to him all sacred functions until more ample information. There soon arrived (at Rome) the priest who, after a thousand difficulties, had brought the act of appeal of the Patriarch Ignatius. Other faithful Orientals accompanied him. The Sovereign Pontiff, informed by them of the whole affair, convoked a synod at Rome (April, 863), and, after mature examination, declared Photius fallen from the priesthood, and forbidden, under pain of anathema, to exercise any sacred function. Ignatius was reinstated, as also the bishops who had remained faithful; the faithless legates were excommunicated.||

Meanwhile Photius endeavoured to affirm his authority as if it had been legitimate. He combated heretics in numerous works; wrote to the Paulinians and to the Monophysite

* Pope Nicholas reproached him in these terms: "Cum nos inter alia commemorassemus quod multoties conventus factus fuerit sanctorum Patrum, a quibus et deliberatum ac observatum extitit qualiter absque Romanæ Sedis Romanique Pontificis consensu nullius insurgentis deliberationis terminus daretur; vos erasistis 'absque,' et interposuistis 'cum,' significare scilicet intentantes deliberatum fuisse a sanctis patribus ut cum Sedis Apostolicæ et Ecclesiæ vestræ consensu omnis rei finis debeat omnino proferri." Epist. 9.

† Nicolai I., Epist. ad Or., 4.

‡ Nicolai I., Epist., 5.

§ Nicolai I., Epist., 6.

|| S. Nicolai I., Epist., 7.

Armenians to bring them back to the true faith, and sent missionaries among the Slavs, the Chazari, the Bulgarians, and the Russians. On the other hand he showed himself indulgent towards the amusements of a debauched Court, and even took part therein. When the sentence of Nicholas I. arrived, he set to work to turn the Emperor against that Pope, under the pretext that he usurped the Emperor's own rights. The Emperor wrote to Rome, by the hand of Photius, letters full of menace, in which he refuses to recognise the spiritual supremacy of the See of Rome.* These claims gave the Pope occasion to defend the rights and the primacy of the Roman Pontiff. He wrote back to the Emperor :

If you will not hear us, we must treat you as Jesus Christ has commanded us to treat those who refuse to hear the Church. For, the privileges of the Roman Church, confirmed to blessed Peter by the mouth of Christ himself, established in the Church herself, guarded from antiquity, proclaimed by Ecumenical Councils, and always respected by the Church, cannot, in anything whatever, be either diminished or violated or changed; because human efforts cannot overturn what is founded, strengthened and supported by God Himself. The privileges of this See are perpetual; rooted, in some sort, and planted by a Divine hand, they may be wounded but not transplanted, violated but not destroyed. They continue, thanks be to God, what they were before your reign; they will subsist after you, and as long as the Christian name shall be preached, they will continue without diminution. These privileges, which are rather a burden than an honour to us, oblige us to extend our pastoral solicitude to all the Churches.†

Afterwards, pushing condescension to its extreme limits, the Pope consented to make a new enquiry, on condition that the two parties came personally to, or caused themselves to be represented at, Rome, where the affair should be judged, as had been done under Julius III. in the affair of St. Athanasius, Patriarch of Alexandria.

Photius, seeing that all the artifices made use of had failed to move the Pope, and despairing of conquering his resistance, could no longer restrain himself. He knew that he was supported by the Emperor; he had made himself numerous creatures amongst the clergy and people; he boasted that he had preserved the Empire from the incursions of the Bulgarians by bringing them to the faith by his missionaries and his letters.‡

* S. Nicolai I., Epist., 9.

† Epist., 9.

‡ The Bulgarians, a people from Asia who had settled in the Balkans, arrived at the commencement of the ninth century at the gates of Constantinople. The Christians whom they had subjugated were their first apostles. The sister of King Boris was led captive by the Greeks to Constantinople,

He considered himself therefore strong enough to try schism. Adorning himself ostentatiously with the title of "Ecumenical" Patriarch, which several of his predecessors had given themselves, against the will of the Pope,* he wrote an Encyclical† to the Oriental bishops to unite them together in Council at Constantinople. In this letter, after signalizing the conversion of the Bulgarians, he rises violently against the Latins. He reproaches them with having introduced the fast of Saturday, the celibacy of priests, and other usages which the Greek Church does not observe; but especially he accuses them with having altered the faith by inserting the "Filioque" in the Creed, and thus professing that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son. Finally, he adds, there has come to him from Italy a letter full of accusations against the Pope, whose criminal and tyrannical conduct is insupportable. He made the same complaints against the Latins in a letter written in the Emperor's name to the King of Bulgaria. We will speak further on of the procession of the Holy Ghost "a Filio." As to the complaints arising from the difference of rites and of discipline between the Eastern and Western Churches, Photius

there learned the Christian religion and received baptism. The Empress Theodora permitted her, in 845, to return to Bulgaria. Aided by St. Methodius, who was originally from Thessalonica, the capital of Illyria, the princess succeeded in leading her brother to the faith. Boris received baptism in 864 from the hands of St. Methodius or, according to others, from the bishop Joseph, sent by Photius. The Emperor Michael was his godfather, and gave his own name to him. The example of the king drew the people. Photius wrote a long letter to Boris on the Christian religion (ap. Migne, "Patrol. Græc.," cii. 627). For various reasons, in part political, Boris asked missionaries from Rome and renounced the Greek rites. Nicholas I. sent some, who completed the conversion of the people. The Sovereign Pontiff next gave them an Exarch, and Christian Bulgaria was organized.

* The title of "ecumenical" patriarch (*οἰκουμενικός*), is found already given to John II. (an. 518) and to Mennas (an. 536). This title appears to have had, at first, no other signification than that of Patriarch of all the Empire. Certainly when the Emperor Justinian in his letter, "*γνωσκεῖς*," gives this title to Epiphanius (an. 533), he does not employ it as a synonym for Head of the Universal Church. For in that same letter he declares that "all Churches must of necessity be united with the most holy Pope, the patriarch of old Rome, who is the head of all the priests of God, and who, by his sure and accurate decision, has repressed, at Constantinople itself, the heresies which had arisen." Nevertheless, the title appeared to encroach upon the Patriarchs of Alexandria, of Jerusalem and of Antioch, and in its obvious sense it indicated a pretension to authority over all the Church, which the Sovereign Pontiffs could not tolerate. Hence St. Gregory the Great and his successors have always protested against the title, of which, even at the present day, the Patriarch Joachim III. avails himself.

† "Photii Opera," ap. Migne "Patrol. Græc." cii., col. 721—742.

had already refuted himself in his "Apologetic letter," wherein he justifies his irregular ordination by the difference of discipline in the two Churches.*

In August, 867, Photius gathered in Council all the prelates whom he was able to attract, and had the audacity to excommunicate Pope Nicholas I. and all bishops remaining in communion with him. To give to his conciliabulum some appearance of an Ecumenical Council he falsified the acts, forged signatures, had them imitated by his scribes, and multiplied them to such an extent that about a thousand prelates had signed the excommunication of the Pope. The frauds of Photius are attested by the ambassadors of the Emperor Basil, who brought the manuscript itself to Rome, and by Anastasius Bibliothecarius,† an eye-witness. These false acts were burned in the eighth Ecumenical Council, which was held soon afterwards.

Such is the origin of the Greek Schism, which still endures, and which has taken the East and Russia from the Catholic Church. The point of departure of this sad division is the public censure given by the holy Patriarch Ignatius to an incestuous life. The Church has at all times been obliged to fight for the defence of the holiness of marriage. From St. John Baptist down to the last Archbishop of Cologne, Clement de Droste, it is nearly always on the subject of marriage that the Catholic Church is delivered to the chains of the persecutor. It was the courageous refusal of a Pope to sell to Henry VIII. the right of divorce which separated England from the Roman Church, and it was the refusal to approve of the incestuous union of Bardas by the communion of Epiphany Day which gave rise to the Schism of Photius.

Photius was gifted with all the qualities which make the head of a sect: unbridled ambition, talents, indomitable courage, hypocrisy, cleverness; nevertheless his enterprise would have failed if other more general causes had not favoured it. Foremost must be placed the difference of discipline, rite, and language, and, more than all, the antagonism which existed between the East and the West—between the old and the new Rome. Constantinople, the new Rome, flattered itself that it had shaken

* Photii Epist. 2 ap. Migne "Patrol. Græc." cii. col. 594—618.¹

† Anastasius, "præf. in Concil. VIII.," says:—"Iste falsarius (Photius) falsorum excessum adversus insontem, absentem, et invictum, mendacem codicem compilat, mille circiter antistitum subscriptiones falsas interserit, sibi nemine prorsus consentiente vel conscribente ex numerosa episcoporum multitudine, nisi uno et viginti presulibus." 979 false signatures in the thousand! One understands how authors have believed that Photius invented the whole Council.

off the political yoke of old Rome. It had its own Emperors : its independent authority extended over all the East. The Byzantine Patriarchs wished to be, in the religious way, what the Emperors were in the political—the spiritual chiefs of all the East. Placed in the centre of the Empire, brilliant with all the splendour of the capital, they had under them all the bishops of Asia Minor and of Greece, whilst the Churches of Syria, Palestine, and Egypt, destroyed by the conquests of Islamism, left to the Patriarchs of Antioch, of Jerusalem, and of Alexandria only the shadow of their former splendour, and a small number of faithful. Another cause must be added. Since the Empire of the West had fallen under the hands of barbarians, Constantinople called herself the Queen of the World, the ruler of peoples, the only heiress of the splendour and power of the old Empire of Rome. This national ambition had filtered into things religious. The patriarchs and clergy loved domination : they extolled, beyond measure, their own particular customs, their majestic rites, their canonical discipline which did not exclude married men from the ranks of the clergy. They strove to withdraw themselves, as far as possible, from the supreme authority of the See of Rome. Many patriarchs, it is true, such as St. Chrysostom and St. Flavian, had had recourse to the Pontifical See ; the canons of Sardica had sanctioned appeal to the Roman Pontiff, and both bishops and priests had used the right. The Sovereign Pontiffs had interfered as supreme authorities in the cause of the Patriarch Nectar, in that of Anatolius, and in that of Germanus, in the condemnation of Nestorius, of Dioscorus, and of Anthimus. The Emperors themselves had more than once recognised the primacy of the See of Rome. Nevertheless, out of fifty-eight patriarchs who succeeded each other in the See of Constantinople, from Metrophanes, in 315, to Photius, twenty-one were heretics, or suspected of heresy. Already, again and again, during the schism of Acacius, during the affair of the Three Chapters and the persecutions of the Iconoclasts, relations with Rome had been interrupted. But these interruptions had been only passing. To all these causes, which prepared men's minds for schism, add the state of servitude to which the Emperors had striven to reduce the clergy, both by honours and riches, and by menaces and persecutions ; add, finally, the efforts of the Imperial policy to withdraw itself from the influence of the Holy See, and you have the principal causes of the success of Photius.

Photius did not long enjoy his usurped triumph. A sudden revolution dethroned the Emperor Michael and replaced him by Basil, the Macedonian (24th September, 867). The new Emperor was desirous of peace. He expelled Photius and re-established

Ignatius on the patriarchal throne. Having removed Photius, he endeavoured to remedy the evils of the Church and decide what was to be done with those bishops who had been nominated by the usurper. Ignatius and the Emperor turned their eyes towards Rome, the mother and mistress of all the Churches. An embassy was sent thither. It was composed of the legates of the Emperor, two representatives of Ignatius, and two representatives of Photius, in the manner that Pope Nicholas I. had decided. The false acts of the Council which had been invented by Photius were brought to Rome, and burned by order of the Pope. Adrian II., who had succeeded to Nicholas I., examined in Council, and once more, the cause of Photius, and renewed the condemnation and anathema of his predecessor. The embassy returned to Constantinople, accompanied by three legates of the Pope charged to preside at a Council about to be assembled.

The eighth Ecumenical Council opened at Constantinople 15th October, 869, and continued to 28th February following. Besides the legates of the Holy See and the representatives of Patriarchal Sees, one hundred and two bishops assisted at it. By order of the Emperor, Photius had to appear at the fifth and seventh sessions. Summoned to explain his conduct, he answered nothing, affecting the silence of our Lord before his judges. In vain did the Emperor invite the rebels to repent; in vain did the Council grant them seven days for reflection. Photius, and the bishops ordained by him, persevered in schism and were deposed without new examination, conformably to the sentence of the Pope. All the writings of Photius against the Pope and against Ignatius were burned by order of the Emperor; the primacy of the Roman Pontiff was proclaimed in the 21st canon, and Ignatius was reinstated in his see. Union with Rome was thus re-established. But the germs of disunion remained. Scarcely had the Council ended when the Bulgarian question was raised. The king of the Bulgarians had sent an embassy to Constantinople, asking their incorporation in the Patriarchate of Constantinople. They urged that the country occupied by them had belonged to the Byzantine Empire; that their first priests had come from Constantinople, and that relations with it were easier. On their side the legates urged that the country belonged to the province of Illyria, which depended directly on the Holy See; that spiritual jurisdiction did not change with secular domination; that the Bulgarians had been given to Pope Nicholas; that, besides, the legates had not power to settle this question. The Emperor was hurt at this reply, and other things not tending to peace and cordiality also occurred. Nevertheless the union subsisted until the death of Ignatius in 877.

Meanwhile Photius, three times deposed, lived in the banishment of a monastery, continuing in his schismatical sentiments and employing the infinite resources of his mind in retaining his numerous adherents, in gaining over the Emperor, and in composing learned writings. He succeeded so well in his artifices that the Emperor confided to him the education of his children. Thanks to Imperial favour, on the death of Ignatius he reoccupied the Patriarchal throne; pretending, as before, that he had been forced into it, and employing every means—falsehoods, presents, threats, persecution—to win to his side the faithful bishops. He felt, nevertheless, the need of being recognised by the Pope. John VIII. now occupied the Pontifical throne. Photius first set himself to gain over the legates whom the Pope had sent to Constantinople. In this he succeeded by his usual methods. Then he sent to Rome a crafty monk, who succeeded in deceiving the Pope and obtaining the removal of the censures launched against Photius, and the restoration of his title of Patriarch; but yet, on condition that in the Council at which the pontifical legates were to preside at Constantinople, Photius should ask pardon, and that he should re-establish Bulgaria under the jurisdiction of the Roman Church.

By the time of the arrival of the pontifical legates Photius had so busied himself, had used such expedition in ordaining bishops, in filling episcopal sees with his own creatures, in gaining over the faithful bishops by deceiving them, and in interesting the other Patriarchs of the East, that he was able to assemble a Council of 380 prelates. The Synod opened in November, 880, under the presidency of Photius himself. The letters of John VIII. were read—translated into Greek by Photius himself. As the legates knew no Greek, Photius made the Pope say what he liked. So there was no question of Photius asking for the pardon of the Council, but for the "Divine mercy;" and although the Pope maintained the eighth Council in all its authority, and merely relieved Photius of censures incurred, his Greek version made the Pope condemn the Council and declare the condemnation of Photius null and void. There is proof palpable of this gigantic fraud in the *Registrum* of John VIII., which gives the authentic text of the letters of that Pope, and in the Greek Acts of the Council by Photius. Baronius* has placed the two texts side by side and shown the falsifications. Photius was therefore completely rehabilitated by the Council, and, if one may trust the Acts after seeing what that intriguing prelate was capable of, the legates of the Pope were grievously wanting in their duty. The affair of Bulgaria was left in abeyance. As

* "Annales," ad an. 879.

to the Procession of the Holy Ghost "a Filio," it was not mentioned. But, six weeks after, at a meeting of the legates at the Imperial Palace, Photius got a profession of faith admitted for the East, in which was renewed the prohibition of the Council of Ephesus *to subtract from, or to add to, the symbol of Constantinople*. This was, in the mind of the schismatical Patriarch, to blame, indirectly, the addition of the "Filioque." But if he was content with this much now, he soon renewed his attacks on the subject in a book expressly composed, and entitled: "The Sacred Doctrine concerning the Holy Ghost,"* a book which he spread among the Eastern prelates and even sent into the West. Cardinal Hergenröther, when he was professor at Würzburg, first published this work. In it Photius develops all the arguments which the Greeks urge against the Latins on this point of faith. Mgr. Macarie, the present Archbishop of Moscow, points it out to orthodox Greeks as the best authority to consult.

The Holy See now found itself in very great difficulties. Italy was constantly menaced with incursions of the Saracens; the Pope did not know, with certainty, what had been done at Constantinople. He saw well enough that his orders had not been obeyed. He complained of it to the Emperor and to Photius, whom he, however, left in possession of his dignity. But when he did know exactly the truth, he anathematised the false Patriarch. But Photius knew how to keep this sentence from becoming public in the East, and he went on undisturbedly until the death of the Emperor Basil (+ 885). Leo the Philosopher, the son and successor of Basil, had personal reasons for hating Photius; he expelled him from his see, and confined him in the Armenian monastery of Bordi, where, five years later, he died. Such was the end of the man whom the schismatical Greeks venerate as a saint; whom we rightly regard as the first author of the Greek Schism, and the most fatal enemy that Christian unity ever had.

2. *Michael Cerularius.*

The successors of Photius, Stephen, Anthony Cauleas, Nicholas the Mystic, recognised the authority of the Roman Pontiff, and exhibited on the Patriarchal throne such virtue that the Greek Church venerates them as saints. By their efforts the schism was extinguished in a few years. The union happily re-established lasted a century and a half, almost with-

* *Περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος μυσταγωγίας.* Migne, "Patr. Gr.," t. cii.

out interruption.* Nevertheless, the Church of Constantinople was never radically healed of its wounds. Photius had left the germs of discord deep in men's minds. The complaints against the Church of Rome, although unfounded, as we shall show further on, were re-heard every time any difficulty arose with the Holy See. This, however, was only a secondary cause,—rather, a pretext. The true cause must be sought in the Imperial policy, the ambition of the Patriarchs and the degradation of the clergy, who had become completely servile to the Emperors. The Byzantine Emperors aspired to reconquer the empire of Constantine; and the Sovereign Pontiffs had, in re-establishing the Empire of the West, by the consecration of Charlemagne and his successors, opposed to this aspiration a very solid barrier. The Emperors desired, therefore, to free themselves from Roman authority, and, as the means to this end, to enslave the clergy of Constantinople, to corrupt them, and then to push them into revolt. And this was done. The Emperors arrogated the right to dispose of the Patriarchal See, and placed there their own relatives, friends, or creatures. Simony crept in among the clergy and monasteries. Things went so far that wives were given to monastic men, and husbands to monastic women.† Thus the fourth son of the Emperor Lecapene, named Theophylact, was, in defiance of the canons, fraudulently substituted, at the age of sixteen years, for the Patriarch Tryphon. Thus, again, Sisinnius, from a simple laic, and master of the Imperial Militia, became Patriarch at once and without further preparation. And he hastened to substitute the name of Photius for that of the Pope in the diptychs.‡ This renewal of Schism was only extinguished under his successor Sergius. In order still further to withdraw the Patriarch of Constantinople from Pontifical authority, the Emperor Basil II., in concert with the Patriarch Eustathius, his creature, strove, by money and by force, to obtain the title of "Ecumenical" for the See of Constantinople in the same sense that the Pope was called Universal Pontiff. Another Emperor, Lecapene, profiting by

* We give a list of the Patriarchs who succeeded each other in the See of Constantinople, from Photius to Michael Cerularius; they were all, except Sisinnius, in communion with the Holy See. Stephen (886-893), Anthony Cauleas (893-896), Nicholas the Mystic (896-925), Stephen II. (925-928), Tryphon (928-931), Theophylact (933-956), Polyeucte (956-970), Basil I. (970-974), Anthony II. (974-979), Nicholas II. Chrysoberges (983-994), Sisinnius the Schismatic (996-998), Sergius II. (998-1019), Eustathius (1019-1025), Alexis (1025-1043).

† See the Synod held in 1027 by the Patriarch Alexis. Darras, "Histoire de l'Eglise," t. 20, p. 532.

‡ Darras, "Histoire de l'Eglise," t. 20, p. 386.

the weakness of John XI., obtained that the Patriarchs of Constantinople might take the pallium without having recourse to the Apostolic See. Things were in this state when Michael Cerularius* ascended the patriarchal throne. We must become acquainted with this man, who completed the Greek Schism.

With less education than Photius, and also with less ability, Michael had, in common with him, ambition and the art of falsifying Pontifical documents. At first he was implicated in a political conspiracy and banished to a monastery, where he embraced the monastic life. He was taken hence, in 1043, by the Emperor Constantine Monomachus, to be placed in the See of Constantinople. In the following year he showed what sentiments animated him. In a homily† delivered on the first Sunday of Lent, he confounded, in the same eulogium, Photius and his adversary St. Ignatius, and launched anathema against every one who had written or spoken against these two Patriarchs.

Nine years later he thought himself sufficiently secure in his see to set aside completely the yoke of Pontifical authority. To the complaints which Photius had uttered against the Latins he added new ones,—such as the custom of shaving, of eating the flesh of animals strangled, which, according to him, was contrary to the Council of the Apostles, and of conferring baptism by only one immersion. Above all, he sharply upbraided the Latins with consecrating in unleavened bread. In concert with Leo, the Metropolitan of Acrida, in Bulgaria, he put forth a Synodal Letter, in which he exhibited all these accusations. The Archbishop of Trani caused a copy to reach Pope St. Leo IX., who made a reply, in which he justified the Roman Church with as much erudition as gentleness. He showed that the custom of consecrating with unleavened bread went back to the Apostles, that it is justified by the very institution of the Eucharist, wherein our Lord made use of azyme bread, such as the law of Moses prescribed for the Paschal festival.‡

It was by this question of leavened and azyme bread that Michael drew to his party the Greek Patriarch of Antioch.§

* From *κηρυλαριον*, the place where were kept the candles which the people came to buy and have blessed. Michael had been, at first, in charge of the *κηρυλαριον*, whence his name.

† This homily has been edited by Migne, "Patrol. Græca," t. cxx. col. 723 sqq. The editor shows that Montfaucon made a mistake in attributing it to the Second Council of Nicæa.

‡ St. Leo IX. "Epist. 102 ad Michael. Constant." Migne, "Patrol. Lat." t. 143.

§ See the letter of the Patriarch of Venice to Peter of Antioch, and the reply of the latter, in Migne's "Patrol. Gr." t. 120, col. 751 sqq.

We do not dwell on this point; it has been sufficiently elucidated. Consecration is valid whether leavened or unleavened bread be used. The Church approves of both rites: she obliges the Greeks to use leavened bread, as she obliges the Latins to use unleavened. No serious obstacle to the reunion of the two Churches can arise on this point, any more than on their differences of rite. We confine ourselves to one observation. Many persons believe that all Orientals consecrate, and have always consecrated, with leavened bread. This is an error. The Jacobites and the Nestorians do employ leavened bread: and (except the Copts) they join to it oil and salt. But the Armenians and Maronites use azyme bread, and this was, it is certain, the usage which obtained at Edessa, in Mesopotamia, from the first ages. We have, on this point, the testimony of St. Rabulas, Bishop of Edessa, at the commencement of the sixth century, in his "Letter to Gamulinus," which M. Overbeck has lately edited from Syriac MSS. in the British Museum.* The use of unleavened bread is also recommended in the "Exposition of the Liturgy of St. James," which some attribute to the Patriarch John Maro, and others to the Jacobite bishop Denis Bar-Salibi; and the Armenian Patriarch Gregory, in the twelfth century, reproaches the Jacobites with using leavened bread. The outcry of Michael Cerularius against the Latins on this point has therefore no foundation.

Cerularius did not confine himself to recriminations; he closed the churches of the Latins through all his jurisdiction; he rebaptized those who had received baptism according to the Latin rite; and he went so far as to excommunicate those who had recourse to the Holy See. He arrogated to himself the title of Ecumenical Patriarch, and pretended "that the seat of Empire having been transferred by Constantine to the borders of Asia, it is no longer to Rome, but to Constantinople, that spiritual supremacy now belongs."

The Pope sent three legates to Constantinople to recall the

Peter of Antioch and Michael Cerularius insist chiefly, in support of their opinion, on the fact that the Evangelists say our Lord, for the institution of the Eucharist, took *bread, āpros*. Mgr. Macarie, one of the greatest theologians of the present Russian Church, again insists on this difficulty—which is really not a difficulty; for azyme bread is equally *bread, āpros*, as well in the Septuagint as in the New Testament.

* See what we said on this subject in "Barhebraei Chronicon Eccl." t. i. col. 485, not. 3. These are the words of St. Rabulas. He is opposing certain abuses: "They have the host fermented a long time, and prepared and baked with care, to make for themselves nourishment of that which ought only to serve for the Sacrament of the body of Jesus Christ, which is mystically represented by azyme bread," or, according to another text: "which is received under the species of azyme bread."

Patriarch to his duty. They were well received by the Emperor, but the Patriarch refused to see them. The legates, finding all their efforts useless, proceeded to spiritual penalties. On July 16, 1054, in the presence of the people assembled in the church of St. Sophia, they solemnly placed on the altar the act of excommunication of Michael Cerularius and his adherents: then they departed for Rome. The Patriarch refused to submit, and the Schism was completed. Despite attempts at general reunion, and partial reunions, the great Schism still continues.

Michael had revived the domineering pretensions of Photius; he also imitated his tricks. As soon as the legates had gone he issued a "Synodal Declaration,"* in which he falsified the letter which the legates had written to him, and made the people believe that these legates were impostors, whom the Pope had not sent at all. The following is an extract which will help one to form a judgment of the boldness of this falsifier and new Photius:—

Men who came out of darkness (for they came from the West—the setting sun) arrived in this religious and pious city, from which orthodoxy flows as from a high and plentiful spring, to irrigate with its pure waters the entire universe, and to make the dogmas of a holy faith germinate in souls; these men, like to thunder, or to a tempest, or to a hailstorm, or rather to a wild-boar of the forests, have precipitated themselves upon her, seeking, by their false teaching, to pervert true doctrine. They went the length of placing on the holy altar, in the great church of God, a writing, fulminating anathema against us, against the Orthodox Church, against all who would not allow themselves to be led away by perverse teaching, but wished piety and orthodoxy to flourish. They accuse us of many things, among others of not allowing them to shave our beards and to take from us the man's face which nature has given us, and of not separating ourselves from priests bound by the marriage tie. They upbraid us with our refusal to change the Creed that all the Councils have sanctioned with their invincible decrees: they would like us to use their irregular, perverse, audacious words, professing, with them, that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, and not from the Father only. . . . They went so far as to pretend that they had come from Rome, and that the Pope had sent them, whilst, in fact, they are nobody, and were sent by themselves, and the Pope never sent them. They fabricated letters, coming, they said, from him: others, beside myself, have discovered the falseness of them, particularly by the mark which these letters bear of false seals.

Then he gives the writings of the legates—in his own fashion—and adds that they would not appear before a Synod, and

* "Michaelis Ceral. Edictum Synod," ap. Migne, "Patrol. Gr." t. 120, col. 737 sqq.

that the goodness of the Emperor allowed them to depart. He concludes by anathematizing them.

Michael Cerularius had drawn into his schism the Archbishop of the Bulgarians and the Patriarch of Antioch; he sought also to draw into it the Patriarchs of Jerusalem and Alexandria. It is not exactly known how far he succeeded. However it may be, Michael worked unceasingly to strengthen his schism during the very short reigns of Theodora and Michael Stratoniceus. He grew yet more enterprising under Isaac Comnenus, whose usurpation he had favoured; but he thereby caused his own ruin. Comnenus, in fact, could no longer bear his unreasonable requirements, and banished him to Proconnesus, where he died the same year, 1095. The schism did not die with him: but the Patriarchs freed themselves from the yoke of the Roman Pontiffs only to bend under a still harder yoke—that of the Emperors. They paid dearly indeed for their independence of a spiritual power; for they were henceforth left completely in the grasp of the temporal power. Instead of having to obey an authority wise, paternal, just, which neither interest nor passion could turn aside from right and justice, they were subjected to a power which was rarely impartial, often tyrannical, voluptuous, ambitious, which ruled things spiritual according to its caprices, interests or ambition. Religion, the daughter of Heaven, became the slave of Imperial domination, the daughter of Earth. The Emperors, who had only too often interfered in the election of Patriarchs, arrogated the right of nominating and deposing them at their pleasure. When a Patriarch, faithful to his conscience, opposed the caprices or the ambition of an Emperor, he was sent into exile or banished to a monastery. The Patriarch of Constantinople underwent henceforth all the vicissitudes of the Byzantine Empire, and, according as the latter gained or lost provinces, the patriarchate gained or lost dioceses. It was political events rather than religious questions which henceforward were to determine whether the Bulgarians, the Wallachians, and the Servians were to obey or to reject the authority of the Patriarch.

The capture of Constantinople by the Crusaders in 1204, far from bringing back union, as might have been expected, on the contrary, increased the hatred of the Greeks against the Latins, and deepened the separation still more. There had already been an almost impassable wall between the Church of the East and the Church of the West: a barrier had been raised which a few brave spirits in vain tried to break through—such as Nicetas, Archbishop of Thessalonica, Nicephoras Blemmidas, John Beccus, who courageously defended the Union. On the one hand the acts of rapine and violence of which the Latins

were guilty ; on the other, the perfidious policy of the Greek Emperors, and the hatred and fanaticism of the monks, separated minds more and more, and rendered abortive all the attempts at union made by upright and unprejudiced minds and by the true faithful. Pope Innocent III., in a letter of the year 1205, complains bitterly of the Crusaders—forgetful of their vow—having thrown themselves on Constantinople, and still more of their having “pillaged the treasures of churches, profaned sanctuaries, brought away crosses, images, and relics, in such way that the Greeks, whatever ill treatment they may suffer, cannot make up their minds to return to obedience to the Roman Church, since they see in the Latins only crimes and works of darkness, so that they abhor them as dogs.”

As soon as a Latin Patriarch was established at Constantinople, the Greek Patriarch emigrated and settled himself at Nicæa, where Theodore Lascaris had founded a kingdom on the *débris* of the Greek Empire. The fall of the Latin Empire (1262) allowed the Greeks to return to their ancient possessions. The patriarchate was re-established at Constantinople, and the Schism continued to thrive under the protection of the Emperors, until the taking of Constantinople by the Turks (1453) brought the Greek Church under Mussulman oppression.

3. *Acts of Union. Return to Schism.*

The primacy of the Roman See stands out so evidently in the Acts of the Greek Church, and in the teaching of her doctors, as we will show further on, that when once passion is at rest and search is made honestly for truth's sake, obedience to the Pope comes as a necessity. It is this which gave rise, from time to time, to attempts at union on the part of sincerely pious Emperors and Patriarchs. Two of these attempts are famous : the first is that of the Council of Lyons, in 1274 ; the second, that of the Council of Florence, in 1439.

The Emperor Michael Palæologus having retaken Constantinople from the Latins, with the view of consolidating his throne made urgent advances for the reunion of the two Churches. The sovereign Pontiffs, Clement IV. and Gregory X., seconded, with all their power, this magnanimous intention. After great efforts union was proclaimed at the Council of Lyons, in 1274. The Greeks acknowledged and loudly professed the procession of the Holy Ghost “*a Filio*,” and the primacy of the Holy See over all the Church, and declared their faith to be in everything that of the Apostolic See. In return, the Greeks were authorised to keep their rites and recite their

Creed as of old, without the addition of the "Filioque."* John Beccus or Veccus having become Patriarch of Constantinople, defended with as much energy as talent the union thus effected; he justified the dogma of the Procession of the Holy Ghost "a Filio," in eloquent discourses and in learned writings. He composed a treatise expressly against the "Mystagogia" of Photius, in which he refutes him point by point. Cardinal Hergenröther† published this valuable work some years ago. But the greater part of the Greek prelates and monks hardened themselves in schism. They were exiled or dismissed. Troubles followed, in the midst of which the Emperor died (1282). His son and successor, Andronicus II., recalled the schismatical bishops, and broke up the union in less than six years after it had been established.

But the alarming advance of Islamism, which was taking possession, one after another, of the Greek possessions in Asia and in Europe, and the approach of the Turks to Constantinople, once more turned eyes towards Rome and thoughts to reunion. After not a few difficulties union was again effected in the Council of Florence. All the points of separation between Greek and Latin were warmly and fully discussed, and at last settled by common agreement after a most profound examination.‡ One only prelate, Mark of Ephesus, opposed to the end. The Decree of Union was proclaimed July 9, 1439, by Pope Eugene IV., and received the signatures of the Emperor John Palæologus, of the legates, of the Patriarchs of Antioch, Alexandria, and of Jerusalem,§ and of all the clergy, Eastern and Western, present at the Council.|| The following are the principal enactments of this memorable Act, written in both Greek and Latin:¶

* See the "Letter" of Michael Pal. to Gregory IX. in Labbe, "Concil. Collect." t. xi. p. 966, and Benedict XIV. Constit. "Allatæ sunt." n. XI.

† It is inserted in the great collection of Greek Fathers by Migne, t. 112, together with the other writings of John Beccus.

‡ The résumé of these discussions may be seen in the work of Pitzipios, "L'Eglise Orientale," part ii. Rome, 1855.

§ The Patriarch of Constantinople had just died, an adherent of the union.

|| Mark of Ephesus had withdrawn.

¶ The Greek and Latin text is to be found in Hardouin, "Concil. Collect." x. 423. This is the Latin text:—"In nomine sanctæ Trinitatis Patris et Filii et Spiritis Sancti, hoc sacro universali approbante Florentino Concilio diffinimus, ut hæc fidei veritas ab omnibus Christianis credatur et suscipiatur, sicque omnes profiteantur, quod Spiritus Sanctus ex Patre et Filio æternaliter est et essentium suam, suumque esse subsistens habet ex Patre simul et Filio, et ex utroque æternaliter tanquam ab uno principio et unica spiratione procedit: declarantes quod id, quod sancti doctores et patres dicunt ex Patre per Filium procedere Spiritum

"In the name of the Holy Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, with the approbation of the holy and universal Council of Florence, we define that this truth of the faith ought to be believed and received by all Christians, and that all should profess: that the Holy Ghost is eternally from the Father and the Son, and that he receives eternally his essence and existence from the Father and simultaneously from the Son; that he eternally proceeds from both as from one principle and by one only spiration. We declare that the assertion of holy doctors and fathers who say that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father through the Son, goes to signify that just as is the Father so is the Son—according to the Greeks the cause, according to the Latins the principle, of the subsistence of the Holy Spirit. And because all that the Father has, the Father himself has given to his only begotten Son, in begetting him—all except his Paternity, so the Son receives eternally from the Father of whom he is eternally begotten, even this, that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son. We define also, concerning the words 'Filioque' that they were lawfully and reasonably added to the Creed for the sake of explaining the dogma, and were necessary at the time. Also that the body of Christ is truly produced in azyme, or in leavened wheat bread, and that priests ought to consecrate the Lord's body in the one or in the other, each according to the usage of his own Church, whether the Eastern or the Western."

After the definition of what concerns Purgatory, a point on which the Greeks made fewer difficulties, the Decree continues:

"We define, also, that the holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff possess primacy over the whole world, and that the Roman Pontiff himself is the successor of blessed Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and the true Vicar of Christ, the head of the whole Church, and the father and doctor of all Christians; and that to him, in the person of blessed Peter, full power has been given by our Lord Jesus

Sanctum ad hanc intelligentiam tendit, ut per hoc significetur, Filium quoque esse secundum Græcos quidem causam, secundum Latinos vero principium subsistentiæ Spiritus Sancti sicut et Patrem. Et quoniam omnia quæ Patris sunt, Pater ipse unigenito Filio suo gignendo dedit, præter esse Patrem, hoc ipsum quod Spiritus Sanctus procedit ex Filio, ipse Filius a Patre æternaliter habet, a quo etiam æternaliter genitus est. Diffinimus insuper, explicationem verborum illorum, 'Filioque,' veritatis declarandæ gratia, et imminente tunc necessitate, licite et rationabiliter symbolo fuisse appositam. Item, in azymo sive fermentato pane triticeo, corpus Christi veraciter confici; sacerdotesque in altero ipsum Domini corpus conficere debere, unumquemque scilicet juxta suæ Ecclesiæ sive occidentalis sive orientalis consuetudinem. . . . Item, diffinimus sanctam Apostolicam sedem, et Romanum Pontificem in universum orbem tenere primatum et ipsum Pontificem Romanum successorem esse Beati Petri principis Apostolorum et verum Christi vicarium, totiusque Ecclesiæ caput et omnium Christianorum patrem et doctorem existere; et ipsi in Beato Petro pascendi, regendi ac gubernandi universalem Ecclesiam a Domino nostro Jesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse; quemadmodum etiam in gestis œcumenicorum conciliorum, et in sacris canonibus continentur."

Christ, to feed, to rule, to govern the Universal Church—even as also is contained in the Acts of the Ecumenical Councils and in the sacred canons.”

Union being thus re-established, the Easterns returned to their sees and the Emperor to Constantinople. Metrophanes, who was elected in place of Joseph, who had died at Florence, published the Union, and the Schism was for the moment extinct. But Mark of Ephesus, who had never ceased his opposition in the Council, soon after sowed new seeds of discord. Many monks of Constantinople and its environs joined their clamour to that of the bishop of Ephesus, and as early as 1452 the Pope was obliged to send to Constantinople, Isidore, the primate of Kieff, to appease the disturbances. The Turks, on their side, seeing in the Roman Pontiff their most redoubtable adversary, strove to detach the Christians of the East from Rome. Thus they urged the three Patriarchs of Antioch, of Jerusalem, and of Alexandria to assemble in Council, in 1443, to declare the Act of Union of Florence wicked, and to separate themselves from the Patriarch Metrophanes.*

The fall of the Byzantine Empire and capture of Constantinople by Mahomet II., in 1453, forcibly put an end to all relations between the East and the West. The Turks, continually at war with Western princes, whom the sovereign Pontiffs aided with all their power, exerted themselves to prevent any relations between their Christian subjects and the Latins. Any Patriarch of Constantinople who should have dared publicly to speak of his union and submission to the Pope, would at once have been considered a traitor, and would have exposed his person, his clergy and his people to the greatest trouble, perhaps even to complete extermination. This explains how Gennadius and his three immediate successors were able to occupy the Patriarchal see without manifesting in their words or acts either any trace of schism, or any mention of the union, or of the sovereign Pontiff. A paramount interest, a supreme necessity may at least excuse, if it cannot justify, their conduct.†

The East thus found itself once more in Schism as did, quite recently, the United-Greeks of Chelm, almost without knowing it. Political reasons, not religious motives, brought about the separation. We have a proof of this in the Greek Churches of Sicily, Austria, and Hungary; they were not subjected to the yoke of the Ottoman, and have remained faithful to the union made at Florence. At the present moment Austria alone counts more than four millions of United-Greeks. If further proof is

* Pitzipios, *opere citato*, p. 59.

† Pitzipios, p. 74—78.

needed let attention be given to the way in which the nomination of the Patriarch Gennadius was made, and the truth of what we have advanced will be easily understood.

Mahomet II. having rendered his name for ever famous by the capture of Constantinople ; having destroyed the beautiful churches of that city ; having converted the sumptuous basilica of Saint Sophia into a mosque, and massacred a multitude of Christians, grew terrified at the solitude which he himself had created, and determined to repeople Constantinople. He summoned the Christians thither, gave them back certain churches, and permitted the free exercise of their worship. The patriarchal throne was vacant. Mahomet desired that a Patriarch should be chosen in accordance with ancient customs. George Scholarius, a very learned monk, who had supported the union at Florence, was elected against his own wish. Mahomet claimed for himself the same rights as the schismatical Emperors had claimed for themselves. Seated on a throne magnificently adorned, in the grand hall of the palace, he received the newly elected bishop and placed in his hand the pastoral staff. Then, forgetting that he was a Mussulman, he pronounced, in Greek, the formula adopted by the Emperors : " The most Holy Trinity, who has given me the Empire, makes thee Archbishop of Constantinople—the new Rome—and ecumenical Patriarch." At the same time he clothed the Patriarch with a rich pallium, enjoining on him to govern the Church according to ancient customs, and constituting him head of all his co-religionists, civilly as well as religiously, with the title of " Milet-Bachi " (head of nation), and with orders to keep all Christians in submission and obedience to the new sovereign. After a long discourse, in which the Patriarch explained to the Sultan the Christian teaching, without making mention of the Pope, the Sultan reconducted Gennadius to the door of the Hall of Audience. A horse from the Sultan's stables, richly caparisoned, was led up for the Patriarch, and the grandees of the palace accompanied him as far as the cathedral. A Berat, or diploma, was sent to him, in the name of the Sultan, which conferred on the Patriarch the largest civil and judicial rights over his co-religionists, and exempted him and his successors from all compulsory labour and taxes. The rights and privileges conferred by the Sultans on different Christian communities are, to this day, regulated according to the tenor of this Berat.

In this manner the Sultan put himself in the place of the schismatical Emperors and excluded all intervention of the Sovereign Pontiff. The Greek Church fell again under the domination of the temporal power, and was more enslaved than ever. Simony quickly made itself felt in the nomination of

Patriarchs, and the Byzantine Church, which the union of Florence had raised up, sank once more into schism and worthlessness. The first Patriarch who bought his dignity from the Sultan, was Simeon. In order to obtain it he bound himself to pay a fine, called *karazion*, of a thousand ducats, and to give up the salary which his predecessors had received from the public treasury. And he was supplanted, at the end of a year, by a rival who engaged to pay a *karazion* of two thousand ducats. And this one again, in his turn, was displaced by a third, who bid fifty ducats more. At last the *karazion*, under the Patriarch Joachim, towards the year 1500, had grown to be three thousand five hundred ducats, without counting gratuities and presents of every sort given to the eunuchs of the palace and to other *employés* of the Sublime Porte.*

In order to be able to meet all these expenses the Patriarch levied a money payment in return for the collation of holy orders. Thus, simony spread to every rank of the clergy, and hence came the promotion to ecclesiastical dignities and to the patriarchate of incapable and corrupt subjects. But efforts were made at times, by pious prelates, to heal the Greek Church of the wound of simony. The Patriarch Jeremiah II. (1572-1594), in a numerous Synod, recalled to notice the canonical prescriptions as to the gratuitous collation of orders, and all bishops were forbidden, under pain of deposition, to receive any recompense for conferring sacred orders. It was this same Patriarch Jeremiah who, in 1584, wrote to Gregory XIII. that "it was his (Gregory's) office as *head of the Catholic Church* to point out what means ought to be adopted against the Protestants."†

It is not our purpose here to trace the history of the attitude which, in spite of its schism, the Eastern Church has maintained towards Protestantism. It is known that in four successive Councils she energetically rejected the errors of Luther, of Calvin, and of the other pretended Reformers.

The Patriarch of Constantinople gradually grew weaker under the iron hand of the Sultans. The erection, in 1589, of a Russian patriarchate at Moscow, by Jeremiah II., diminished very notably the influence of the Greek Church upon the Church of Russia. The foundation of the Holy Synod (1721) completely emancipated the Russian Church from the patriarchate of Constantinople. In their turn the Greek Churches claimed

* Lequien, "*Oriens Christianus*," I. 145 sqq; Pitzipios, *op. cit.*, 2nd part, p. 81, sqq.

† See Schelstrate, "*Acta Orientalis Ecclesiæ contra Lutherum*," I., 219-252.

their autonomy, and were emancipated in 1833. Thirty-six bishops of Greece, assembled at Nauplia (15-27th July, 1833), defined that the orthodox Oriental Church of Greece recognized no other supreme head than Jesus Christ.* As to the temporal administration of that Church it is subject to the King of Greece, who, as supreme chief, names the members of the Synod which is placed at the head of the whole neo-Greek Church, just as the Tzars nominate the Holy Synod of the Russian Church. More recently the Bulgarians have, in like manner, demanded autonomy. After many difficulties the Churches of Bulgaria are at last subject to an exarch, or primate, who is independent of the Patriarch of Constantinople. The last war and the Treaty of Berlin have still further diminished the extent of the jurisdiction of the latter.

ORGANIZATION AND PRESENT CONDITION OF THE GREEK CHURCH.

The Patriarchate of Constantinople. — The Schismatic Greeks who are subjects of Turkey number 11,000,000 to 12,000,000, inclusive of Bulgarians. Like the Russians, they pretend to be, and call themselves, "Orthodox." Their head is the Patriarch of Constantinople, and he assumes the title of Ecumenical Patriarch. By virtue of the 28th canon of the Council of Chalcedon† he is superior to the Patriarchs of Antioch, Jerusalem and Alexandria. The last-named administers the patriarchate during a vacancy. The Patriarch is not only spiritual head of all who profess the Greek religion, but also their temporal head, under the supreme sovereignty of the

* Nevertheless the Patriarchs of Constantinople never ceased to assert their rights over Greece. But at last, seeing that their demands were useless, they definitely recognized, in 1868, the autonomy and independence of the Church of Greece.

† This canon reads thus:—"The throne of ancient Rome, because it was the capital of the Empire, was adorned with privileges by the Fathers. For the same motive the hundred and fifty bishops, beloved of God, decide to attribute the same privileges to the throne of New Rome, so that she may enjoy equal privileges with ancient Rome, even in matters ecclesiastical, and thus be raised in honour the second after her. . . ." This same canon extends the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Constantinople over the provinces of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace. But this canon, decreed in the absence of the Pope's legates, was never ratified. It is wanting from the "Canonical Collection" of Dionysius Exiguus. The essential part of it is wanting even in a MS. of Moscow, as was noticed by Cardinal Pitra in his great work "*Juris Eccles. Græc. Historia et Monumenta*," I., 532. The Emperors of Constantinople having arranged the hierarchical order of the Patriarchal Sees thus:—Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem—Innocent III., in the fourth Council of Lateran, ratified it, ordering that every Patriarch should receive the pallium from the Supreme Pontiff, and take an oath of obedience to him.

Sublime Porte. The Ottoman Government does not interfere in the spiritual and interior administration of the different Christian communities of the Empire. The Patriarch is named for life, and cannot be deposed except for the crime of high treason. But the Holy Synod can, in two cases, solicit and obtain of the Government his deposition: 1. for violation of the Orthodox faith; 2. for maladministration of the patriarchate. This last point has often given opening to intrigue and consequent unjust depositions.

*The Holy Synod.**—To assist him in his spiritual and temporal functions the Patriarch has a Council called the Holy Synod, and, in addition, a considerable number of functionaries, lay and ecclesiastical. The Holy Synod is generally composed of twelve bishops of metropolitan rank. The Patriarch may reduce the number to ten, but not lower: he presides over the Synod, and freely chooses its members, except the metropolitans of Heraclea, of Cyzicus, of Nicomedia and of Chalcedon, who, as nearest to the capital, are members by right, and guardians of the patriarchal seal. By reason of this function and of the part which they must continually take in synodal affairs, these four metropolitans have right of residence at Constantinople, and the Patriarch cannot oblige them to return to their dioceses. According to ancient custom, based on the canons, and expressly recognised by the Porte, all patriarchs, metropolitans and bishops who are present in Constantinople, have the right to take part in the deliberations and decisions of the Synod whenever affairs of importance have to be dealt with. Ordinary business is expedited by the Patriarch and the four metropolitan guardians of the seal. Appeals from the decisions of bishops are tried by the Holy Synod; its own judgments are final. The Synod is the natural Council of the Patriarch, who can decide nothing in the general affairs of the Church, spiritual or temporal, without its consent. Its consent is likewise required for the nominations made by the Patriarch to vacant sees. To it alone belongs the right of judging the Patriarch and pronouncing on his culpability or innocence,—except as to high treason, the examination of which charge is reserved to the Divan. In case the Patriarch should be declared guilty, his sentence is notified to the Porte, which, at the request of the Synod, pronounces the deposition of the Patriarch. This right forms the chief prerogative of the Synod. The Synod also regulates the ecclesiastical revenues, and makes their distribution. It has its own seal, formed of four pieces, of

* For all that follows, see Silbernagel, "Verfassung und gegenwärtiger Bestand sämtlicher Kirchen des Orients," Landshut, 1865, p. 1—71.

which one is entrusted to the Patriarch and the three others to three metropolitans chosen by the Synod. The meetings of the Synod generally are held on Sundays and festivals after Divine service. Most of the Synodal decrees are rendered operative by an Imperial firman.

Election of the Patriarch.—When the patriarchal see becomes vacant, the members of the Holy Synod, as well as the archbishops and bishops present in Constantinople, assemble in the Patriarchal Palace situated in the Fanar (Greek Quarter), in the hall called *Synodicon*. Here, in the presence of a Government commissary, they proceed by vote to the choice of three candidates. Formerly the candidates might be taken from the ranks of the inferior clergy; at the present day they must have the dignity of metropolitans. This election completed, the result is directly communicated to the "Community" assembled in the court of the Synodicon. The Community, or Nation, is composed of dignitaries of the Patriarchal Palace, both cleric and lay, of notables chosen from the upper merchant class and the *bourgeoisie*, and of heads of corporations. The Community mark that one of the three candidates whom they accept by the ancient acclamation "Axios" (ἄξιος, worthy). The Act is at once prepared and signed. The Synod immediately transmits the result to the Porte. The latter, after the payment of a sufficiently large "karazion," grants the Berat, or diploma of investiture, in which the powers and privileges of the Patriarch are determined and detailed. The day after the election, the newly-elect pays an official visit to the Grand Vizier, who delivers to him his Berat, and, according to ancient usage, gives him, as presents, rich ornaments, a pastoral staff of elegant workmanship, and a white horse. Then the Patriarch calls upon the other ministers to make his official visit, and then comes the enthronization, which takes place with great pomp at the cathedral. When the *cortége* arrives at the door of the cathedral, the secretary of the Grand Vizier reads the Berat, and the procession then enters. The metropolitan of Heraclea presides at the ceremony: this right comes to him from ancient date; for anciently the Bishop of Constantinople was under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Heraclea. The latter conducts the Patriarch to his throne and seats him in it three times: at each time the assembly repeat the cry "Axios;" and at the same time the celebrant sends the Patriarch his mitre and pastoral staff.* A solemn Mass ends the ceremony.

Jurisdiction of the Patriarch.—As we have already said, the Patriarch is at the same time spiritual and temporal chief of the

* The patriarchal staff differs from the crosier of our bishops.

Schismatical Greek community of the whole Empire. He has, therefore, two jurisdictions, the spiritual and the temporal. The first extends over all the dioceses of Turkey in Europe, and over all those dioceses of Turkey in Asia which are outside the patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria. In recent times the exarchates of Bulgaria and Montenegro made themselves autonomous, as Greece had done already. The canons regulate the spiritual powers of the Patriarch. He is the supreme authority in the Church, makes laws, governs, and administers. He also settles disputes arising in the dioceses, always with the assistance of his Council. Both priests and people greatly fear his excommunications, because they are thereby deprived of all defence before Mussulmans; and if they die without having been absolved are deprived of ecclesiastical sepulture.

The *Berat* details his principal powers as follows:—

The Patriarch has the direction of the Orthodox Greek churches and monasteries, and the superintendence of their financial administration. He may, at his pleasure, nominate and depose the archbishops and bishops. It is on his proposition that the Porte grants the *Berats* necessary to newly-nominated bishops. The Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem cannot come to the capital without the permission of the Patriarch and his Synod.

The Patriarch and his Vicar have the entire duties on marriages and wills.

The Patriarch has the right of inflicting penalties on members of the clergy conformably to the canons of the Church. All the faithful are rigorously bound to obedience to the Patriarch, who can strike them with excommunication and refuse them ecclesiastical burial.

The Patriarch has, besides, right of *stauropegion** in all his dioceses, and the exclusive power of consecrating the holy chrism.

As temporal head, the Patriarch has various civil and judicial duties. He can cite delinquents to appear before his tribunal (*κρίτηριον*) and inflict correctional punishment on them. He has, in consequence, his police (*kawas*) and his special prison. His tribunal, presided over by himself or his protosyncellus, sits twice a week, on Wednesdays and Fridays. The sittings are public. All civil disputes between Greeks are brought before his court and judged by the Byzantine law, such as it existed under the Emperors. Mixed cases between Greeks and Turks belong to Mussulman courts. We know of what injustice the Christians have been the victims in these latter courts, where the

* That is to say, of planting a cross in the spot where the altar is to be placed, of a church or monastery which it is desired to build. The church or monastery is subject to him who planted the cross.

Mussulmans are always right and Christians always wrong. The Treaty of Berlin has introduced various modifications in favour of the Christians in this matter of administering justice. Article 62 stipulates that "all subjects of the Sultan are admitted, without distinction of religion, to give testimony before the tribunals." There are particular stipulations for Bulgaria, Eastern Roumelia, and the island of Crete. Formerly Christians were not admitted to give testimony in Mussulman courts at all. The judiciary power of the Patriarch no longer extends to Bulgaria (now an autonomy); it is and will be further modified, or even suppressed, for Eastern Roumelia, Crete, and Cyprus, according as judiciary organization develops itself. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the administration being under Austria, the temporal power of the Patriarch of Constantinople will necessarily diminish, if not die out.

It should be carefully noted that in all these matters, whether civil or religious, the Patriarch must act in concert with his Synod. All the Patriarchal ordinances, before they are valid in the eyes of the Government, must bear the seal of the Synod.

Revenue and Expenses.—The revenues of the Patriarchate are very considerable. First, possessions left behind by metropolitans, bishops, unmarried priests, monks and religious dying without legal heirs, fall to the Patriarch. If the persons just enumerated leave heirs, the Patriarch has a claim only to church goods entered in the sacristy. But these persons may make a legacy in favour of the Patriarch, and this may extend to a third of their fortune. Bishops and monasteries subject to the immediate jurisdiction of the Patriarch pay him an annual contribution. Each priest of the province pays annually a sequin or a ducat; and lay people a tax of ten *aspers*. Add to this the installation dues from metropolitans and bishops, which rise from 150 to 750 *pounds* sterling, ordination dues, collation of benefices, marriage and funeral fees in his own diocese, chancellor's dues, law costs, and offerings of the faithful whether in money or in kind, as silk, honey, wine, oil and provisions. The Patriarch, his agent at the Ottoman Court, and fifteen persons of his entourage, are exempt from the *harady* and other taxes. But, in return, the Patriarch must pay the public treasury an annual royalty of 20,000 piastres and the tax *kalemye*, that is, the tithes. To which add the expense of supporting soldiers of guard, and of his investiture presents and the other presents he must make in different circumstances to Turkish ministers and functionaries.

The Patriarchal Court.—The Patriarch has a numerous household to help him in the ecclesiastical and civil administration. We may enumerate: 1. *The Grand Econome* (μεγας

οικονομος), charged with the administration of the property and the receiving of the revenues, as also with the presentation of subjects to be admitted to holy orders; 2. *The Grand Visitor* (μεγας σακελλαριος), whose office it is to make a visitation of the monasteries of men twice a year. A second visitor is charged with the convents of women; 3. *The Grand Sacristan* (σκευοφυλαξ), the guardian of the Holy Synod; 4. *The Grand Chartophylax*, who is occupied with ecclesiastical causes; 5. *The Prothonotary*, who has in his care wills, contracts, and the correspondence of the Patriarch; 6. *The Grand Logothete* (μεγας λογοθετης), one of the most influential persons in the Patriarchal Court, and about whom we must say a word. The Grand Logothete is a layman chosen by the Patriarch and his Synod from among the nobility of the Greek community. He is the Political Agent of the Patriarchate at the Ottoman Porte. He cannot enter on his duties until he has been received by the Porte. He represents the Patriarch with the Government in all temporal matters; all official communications of the Patriarch with the Government pass through his hands and must be sanctioned by him. He countersigns the Synodal Decrees for the nomination of metropolitans and bishops; and these decrees have no legal force until so signed by him. Among the Patriarchal functionaries we may also name the *Protekdikos* (προτεκδικος), who, with his twelve assistant judges, forms a special court charged with judging cases of minor importance and referring such as ought to be referred to the Patriarch. The Patriarch has also his assistants for the religious offices, and the above-mentioned officials have their assigned places in the choir. All priests, under pain of suspension, must, at Mass, proclaim aloud the name of the Patriarch from the ambo. The present Patriarch of Constantinople has taken the name of Joachim III. He was elected in 1878. His authority is weakened and narrowed with that of the Ottoman Porte, on which he depends.

The other Patriarchs.—The lamentable condition of the Schismatic-Greek Churches of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem, reduced to a few thousands of faithful, makes these ancient patriarchates now count for almost nothing. But, from a purely ecclesiastical point of view, they still preserve their ancient prerogatives. They are independent of the Patriarch of Constantinople; they have, like him, their synods, their officials, though on a smaller scale, and the spiritual prerogatives granted to their patriarchates by the canons. They also receive their Berat of investiture; but they cannot obtain it except by the mediation of the Patriarch of Constantinople, and it is only by means of him that they can have relations with the Ottoman Government and exercise any civil authority.

The first place, after the Patriarch of Constantinople, belongs to the Patriarch of Alexandria, whose jurisdiction extends over Egypt, Lybia, Nubia, and Arabia. He can count scarcely more than 5,000 subjects. The Patriarch of Antioch occupies the next place in rank. His jurisdiction extends over Syria, Cilicia, Mesopotamia, Isauria, and other Asiatic provinces, and the number of his subjects, since the island of Cyprus was made a separate archbishopric, may amount to 28,000. Formerly this patriarchate numbered 150,000 souls. The Patriarch of Jerusalem holds under his jurisdiction the Holy Places, with 15,000 souls. He does not reside in his diocese, but at Constantinople, near the Fanar. The business of the Patriarchate is done by three bishops, living at the great Greek convent, and having the title of Patriarchal Vicars. These bishops, with the others of the province and the Archimandrites of the monasteries, compose the Patriarchal Synod. This Synod names the Patriarch whenever the See becomes vacant. In 1843 the Patriarch of Constantinople wished to arrogate to himself the nomination, but the Synod resisted, and gained its cause after a contest of two years.

Archbishops and Bishops.—There are now few ecclesiastical provinces and archbishoprics with suffragans in Turkey, so that the title of archbishop or of metropolitan is often no more than a title of honour. The archbishops and bishops are named by the Patriarch and his Synod, and receive through him the *Berat* by which the Porte invests them with their charge and fixes their rights and privileges. Their deposition has no legal force until it is invested with the seal of the Holy Synod. As the archbishops and bishops are restricted to celibacy, it follows that they are necessarily nearly always taken from the monks. In ordinations the *interstitia* must be observed. At least three months must elapse between the priesthood and the episcopate. Promotion to the episcopate cannot take place before the age of thirty years; an irreproachable life and sufficient knowledge of the Holy Scripture and the canons are required. The assistance of three bishops is requisite at the consecration of a bishop. Formerly the consecrating prelate was the metropolitan; at present it is the Patriarch, because the metropolitans are scarcely considered more than simple bishops.

After receiving the *Berat* which the Porte grants them, the bishops administer their dioceses as freely as the Patriarch does his own. Their powers are regulated by the canons received by the Greek Church. These canons are to be found gathered together in the *Nomocanon* of Photius, in the *Collection* of Balsamon, of Zonares and of Blastaras. According to these canons a bishop has absolute power over his clergy; it is his

duty to confer orders, and to appoint to cures, and to the various ecclesiastical offices. He is forbidden, under pain of deposition, to ordain a cleric who is not of his own diocese. To a bishop falls the burden of caring for his flock, instructing them, and inflicting canonical penalties. Therefore, it is necessary that he should reside in the midst of his subjects. An absence of six months, not justified by legitimate motives, brings on him the penalty of deposition. But a bishop whose Church has fallen into the hands of Infidels may be promoted to another Church. The administration of ecclesiastical property belongs to the bishop, who cannot alienate anything, more particularly real estate. He has under his jurisdiction all the monasteries of his diocese, except those which are immediately dependent on the Patriarch; and no new monastery can be built without his permission.

Revenues and Special Powers.—In every parish a collection is made annually for the bishop. A commission of four or five laymen gather the offerings, going from house to house, to every family. These offerings are of wheat, oil, wine, silk, &c. Each pays besides for the *canonicon* ten to twelve aspers. Each priest of the diocese pays annually a ducat to the bishop. Each cure pays the *Batiki*; that is to say, 20 paras a family. The ordination dues are from 100 to 300 piastres. Besides these there are the tax for dispensations, the dues for marriages, burials, the blessing of water on Epiphany Day, and the *honoraria* for Masses. All these united form, for some bishops, a large revenue: thus the metropolitan of Smyrna enjoys an annual revenue of a million-and-a-half of piastres.

The name of the diocesan bishop must be proclaimed from the ambo at Mass, as is done for that of the Patriarch. The bishop wears, for the pontifical offices, the particular ornaments special to the Greek Church: outside the church he dresses always in the monastic habit. From a political point of view the metropolitans and bishops exercise, in the provinces in which their dioceses are situated, considerable influence, because they form part of the administrative Council of the Vilayet. The regulation of 1868 has special ordinances for the isle of Crete.

The archbishops and bishops, like the Patriarch, have their synod and their *employés*, more or less numerous according to the importance and condition of their diocese. They have a *Protosyncellus*, who performs the functions of the Latin Vicar-General, and a *Protopresbyter*, who holds the place of the ancient Chorepiscopi, visits the churches of the diocese, watches over the clergy, installs the *curés* named by the bishop, and executes episcopal sentences. The protopresbyters resemble very much

our deans or archpriests. The *Chartophylax*, or chancellor, receives wills, and is occupied with all that regards the civil administration. Hence he enjoys great importance. The synod is formed of the dignitaries above mentioned, and of the notables chosen by the community. The bishop, or his protosyncellus, presides over it: it judges civil and religious cases according to the Byzantine *Nomocanon*.* Mixed cases between Turks and Christians, and criminal cases, belong to the Mussulman tribunals.

Under the impulse given by the Patriarch George VI., and by the Holy Synod, there has been formed in every diocese (after the pattern of what was done in the diocese of Constantinople) an ecclesiastical commission composed of three members, who assemble on certain days to treat of ecclesiastical affairs. The first is concerned with ordinations, and examines the qualities of the candidates for sacred orders. The second watches over the sale and publication of books; no book can be published without his *imprimatur*. He also overlooks the administration of the Sacraments. The third has the schools under his care: these he carefully visits,—for, we may remark, the Christians have their own schools, and the Mussulmans do not at all interfere with them. He also overlooks the preaching of Christian doctrine.

The Parochial Clergy.—The clergy of a parish consist of a *Proestos*, or *curé*, whose work is to baptize, marry, and perform the funeral services; of a *Pneumaticos*, or Confessor, who is approved by the bishop; and of an *Ephemerios*, who celebrates mass and recites the canonical hours. In poor parishes there is only one priest, with a deacon or a simple lector. Cures are readily conferred by the bishops, or, to speak more correctly, they are sold; for simony has infected, with its pernicious poison, every ecclesiastical charge. The revenues of the parochial clergy are meagre. They are reduced to the yearly assessment of each parishioner, and the stole-fees, which amount to very little. Thus from five to ten piastres is given for a baptism, three to five for a funeral, and five piastres for a requiem Mass.

As the priests are, in general, married, they cannot support their families on these slender resources, and they are obliged to perform manual labour, and, in defiance of canonical prohibitions, to follow a trade, or at least to cultivate the fields, which renders them contemptible in the eyes of the Turks. From this it may easily be inferred that they are uneducated and very ignorant. They are taught to read and write in a monastery,

* The *Nomocanon* is called *πρὸς δαλιον*. An edition of it was published at Leipzig in 1800, by order of the Patriarch of Constantinople.

and they know the ceremonies of the Church,—and that is all. People who declaim against the celibacy of priests, will surely not pretend that marriage has elevated the Greek clergy; and the Easterns, who so loudly inveighed at the Council of Florence against celibacy, have themselves given it its condemnation, for they require celibacy in their bishops. But if celibacy is not against nature for bishops, who live in the world just as do the parochial clergy, why should it be for these clergy themselves? It should be remarked, too, that the marrying which the Church, in condescension to human frailty, permits to the Eastern clergy, is subjected to certain conditions. Sacred orders may be conferred on a married man who may remain a married man; but once raised to the priesthood, the priest can never afterwards contract marriage, and should he become a widower, he cannot re-marry. Consequently, those who aspire to sacred orders take care to get married beforehand. It is forbidden to raise to the priesthood a cleric who has married a dishonoured girl. All the Eastern priests wear their beards.

Monasteries.—There are many Greek monasteries of men and of women in Turkey. They all belong to either the order of St. Basil or of St. Anthony; those of the order of St. Basil are the more numerous. The order of St. Anthony has monasteries only in the Lebanon, at Sinai, and on the shores of the Red Sea. The monks' habit consists of a long robe of coarse stuff, a leathern belt, a cloak, a scapular and a hood (*κουκουλιον*) ornamented with five crosses. This hood covers the head in the form of a cap, and then falls and covers the shoulders with a species of mantle. The monks wear their hair long, and their beards, and have a large tonsure on the top of their heads. Most of them are laics. Those who are priests have the title of Hieromonachoi (*ιερομοναχοι*).

The greater part of the monks lead a cenobitic life, that is to say, they live in community. There are now no more solitaries, or hermits, except on Mount Athos. There are there large monasteries called *Lauras* (*λαυραι*), wherein each of the monks has a separate dwelling, and they assemble together in the common refectory only on great feasts. The abbot of a monastery has the title of *Hegumenos* (*ηγουμενος*), and the abbot of one of the large monasteries is called an archimandrite. The monks may never use flesh meat, and on fast days are forbidden the use of fish, eggs, oil, and milk foods: they are bound to the canonical hours and have to remain in choir the entire night before certain great feasts. For the rest, they divide their time between the reading of Holy Scripture and work. A monk may not go from one monastery to another; but he may quit the religious life with the permission of his superior. A woman

who should lodge in a monastery of men would incur excommunication ; the same would be the case with a man in a monastery of women. But entrance into monasteries of men is permitted to women for purposes of cleaning and washing, and the "enclosure" in houses of women is not very strict. Like the monks, the nuns follow the rule of St. Basil.

Greek Rites.—The liturgical offices in the Greek churches and monasteries of Turkey, except with the Slavs and Roumanians, are performed in the Greek tongue, and according to special rites that are very ancient and most solemn. The liturgical books of the Greeks are :—the "Horologion," a sort of Breviary which contains the offices and prayers of the canonical hours ; the "Triodion," which contains the offices of Lent, beginning with Septuagesima, on to Holy Saturday inclusive ; the "Pentecostarion," for the offices of Paschal time, from Easter Day to the octave day of Pentecost inclusively ; the "Heortologion," or Calendar, which indicates the feasts, ferias, and fasts of the Greek Church ; the "Typicon," or "Ordo," which points out the order of prayers at the Divine office ; the "Menæa," which contains the lives of the saints recognised and honoured by the Eastern Church ; lastly, the principal book, the "Euchology," contains the rites and prayers for the Mass and the administration of the Sacraments. The Dominican Father Goar published an edition of the last named at Paris in 1647.

The Church of Constantinople uses for the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice two liturgies (*λειτουργίαι*) ; that bearing the name of St. Chrysostom and that of St. Basil. The liturgy of St. Chrysostom is the ordinary one, and serves all the year round, and contains the ordo of all Masses and all the rubrics. That of St. Basil contains neither the order of the different prayers nor the rubrics, because these are found in the ordinary liturgy. It is used only on certain fixed days. During Lent, except on Saturdays and Sundays, the priest does not consecrate, and there is no Mass, properly speaking ; he celebrates with a host consecrated on the previous Sunday. This they call the liturgy or Mass of the "presanctified:" the Latin Church follows this usage only on Good Friday. Of course, the Greek Church celebrates with leavened bread. Like the Latin Church, she has three classes of feasts besides Sundays : feasts of our Lord, of our Lady, of the Saints. The feasts of our Blessed Lord and His Holy Mother are nearly the same in both rites, except that the Epiphany or Theopany, which is celebrated on January 6th, has, with the Greeks, only one object : the manifestation of Jesus Christ at the moment of his baptism in the Jordan. In memory of this event the "Solemn Blessing of Water" takes place in the Greek Church on this day.

Formerly this ceremony took place at midnight, with the church brilliantly illuminated: the baptism of catechumens followed, and each one took home a small phial of the blessed water, which, on the authority of St. Chrysostom, was said to remain pure the whole year. At present the Greeks bless the rivers and streams on Epiphany Day, and as soon as the blessing is over, men and women plunge into the river, and immerse themselves three times. The Latins have always included in the feast of Epiphany the adoration of the Magi, the miracle of Cana, and the baptism of our Lord; the Greeks, on the contrary, join the adoration of the Magi to the feast of Christmas. This usage is very ancient in the Eastern Churches, as may be seen from the writings of St. Ephrem.* Just as in the Latin Church, flesh meat is allowed when Christmas Day falls on a Friday, so, in the Greek Church, meat is allowed when Epiphany Day falls on either a Wednesday or a Friday.

In the Greek rite, on the day following each feast of our Lord and the Blessed Virgin, they celebrate the memory of the Saints who took part in the mystery of such feast. Thus, on the day following Epiphany is celebrated the commemoration of St. John Baptist; on the day following, the Purification, which they call *Hypapante* ("Meeting," because St. Simeon met our Saviour), is consecrated to St. Simeon. With the Greeks, as with the Latins, the greater feasts have their vigils with fast; but, in addition, the Greeks have, for the Epiphany and great solemnities, what they call *Proertia*, or ante-feast. The proertia of the Epiphany is kept on January 2nd.

The rites followed by the Greeks in the administration of the Sacraments may be seen in Goar's edition of the "Euchology." We could not enter into details without stretching our Article beyond bounds: we must confine ourselves to a few general observations. The Greeks baptize by immersion, and require triple immersion, which is not at all, though they have maintained it is, required for the validity of baptism; this Catholic theologians have long ago incontestably demonstrated. Directly after baptism, the priest, not the bishop, administers confirmation. The Greeks do not rank the sub-diaconate among Sacred Orders. Marriage is surrounded with touching ceremonies, and the tie is indissoluble; though they pretend that it may be dissolved for adultery. The difficulties they raised on this subject at the Council of Florence are well known. Pope Eugenius IV. refused to consent to legitimising divorces that had been granted for this motive.† Impediments to marriage from rela-

* I propose shortly to publish the "Hymns" of this great Syrian writer on the feast of the Epiphany.

† Vide Harduin, "Collect. Concil." x., 430-431.

tionship are more numerous with the Greeks than with the Latins.

Canonical Discipline.—The basis of Greek Canon Law is still, at present, the Apostolic Canons; the Apostolic Constitutions; the Canons of the Councils of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, Chalcedon, and of Trullo; of the particular Councils of Gangres, Laodicea, and Antioch; the Canonical Letters of the Bishops;* the Council of Photius, and the Synodal Decrees of the Schismatical Patriarchs. All these documents, except the latter ones, equally form part of the Canon Law of the United-Greeks. Mgr. Pap-Szilagyí has given a methodical *résumé* of them in his “Enchiridion Juris Eccles. Orient.” We have already touched upon several points of general discipline; we may add here something regarding the fast and feast observances of the people. The Greeks have numerous and very severe fasts; but they do not fast on Saturday, and formerly, under Photius (and later still), have blamed the Latins for abstaining on that day. Their reproach falls to the ground before an acquaintance with the reasons that urged the Western Church to abstain from flesh-meat on Saturdays; and this difference of discipline ought to have no weight whatever in preventing a union of the two Churches. Conformably to the 69th Canon of the Apostles, the Greeks fast on Wednesday and Friday of every week, with a few exceptions. They have Lent, as we have. They have also the “Fast of the Mother of God,” from the 1st to the 15th of August; the fast of Christmas, from the 15th November to the 24th December; the fast of the holy Apostles SS. Peter and Paul, from the first Sunday after Pentecost to the 28th June, and various vigils. The fast of Wednesdays and Fridays, and that of Lent, resembles the Western fast of Good Friday. It includes a rigorous abstinence called by them *zerophagia* (ξεροφαγία);† the use of meat, fish, eggs, wine, milk, beer, cheese, oil, is rigidly forbidden. But wine and oil are often permitted when a feast falls on one of those days—fish more rarely. The other fasts are less rigorous.

In the Eastern, as in the Western Church, the faithful must sanctify the Sunday by assisting at Mass and by abstaining from work—that is, from what is called servile work. They must sanctify, in like manner, a number of other feasts: the

* All these documents are collected by Cardinal Pitra in his great work, “Juris Ecclesiastici Græcorum Historia et Monumenta,” Rome, 1864. Only two volumes have appeared.

† “Concil. Laod.,” can. 50:—“Ὅportet totam quadragesimam jejunare *vescentes aridis*, δειν—*νηστεύειν ξεροφαγούντας*.”

Circumcision, Epiphany, Ascension, the second days of Easter and Pentecost, the Transfiguration, and Christmas ; these feasts of our Lady—the Purification, Annunciation, Nativity, Presentation, the Immaculate Conception—which they call the conception of St. Anne, and the Assumption—the Nativity of St. John, the Feast of SS. Peter and Paul, of St. Elias, St. George, St. Michael, St. Basil, St. John Chrysostom, and some others. But the number of feasts to be observed is not the same with the different nations of the Greek rite. There are other feasts on which it is obligatory to hear Mass, but work is permitted.

It remains for us to sketch, in a future Article, the history of the Russian Church, and to examine what are the general motives which separate all the Churches of the Greek rite from the Latin Church.

T. J. LAMY.

ART. III.—THE APOSTLE OF IRELAND AND HIS MODERN CRITICS.

1. *Confessio et Epistola Sancti Patricii. Acta Sanctorum Martii*, xvii. p. 533. Antwerpiae, 1668.
2. *Triadis Thaumaturgae seu divorum Patricii Columbæ et Brigidæ acta. Colganus.* Lovanii, 1647.
3. *Rerum Hibernicarum Scriptores Veteres.* Auctore Carolo O'Connor, S.T.D. Buckinghamiae, 1825.
 - (a) *Tigernachi Annales Hibernici.* Ex Codice Bodleiano.
 - (b) *Annales Ultonienses.* Ex Codice Bodleiano.
 - (c) *Annales Quatuor Magistrorum.* Ex ipso O'Clerii autographo.
4. *Essays on the Origin, &c., of the Early Irish Church.* By the Rev. Dr. MORAN. Dublin. 1864.
5. *St. Patrick, Apostle of Ireland. A Memoir of his Life and Mission.* By JAMES HENTHORN TODD, D.D. Dublin. 1864.
6. *Loca Patriciana.* By the Rev. JOHN FRANCIS SHEARMAN. Dublin. 1879.

IN the mind of a Catholic devotion to the saints is a personal matter, and it is strong in proportion to his faith. People, therefore, who look on faith as nothing more than a formal adherence to a dead creed, introduced once for all and then left to take care of itself, are puzzled at our expressions of indignation when outrages are offered to the

memory of the saints, or when they are treated as so many lifeless ornaments of the Church, to be put up and taken down, or painted, according to fancy. But if nations are jealous of the honour of their poets and heroes, with much better reason may we be sensitive in all that regards the glory of the just made perfect, whose words and deeds are at once a revelation of our own supernatural destiny and the support of our efforts to attain it.

Besides these claims upon our love and gratitude which are common to all, there are others which are special and personal, such as the obligations each one is under to that Saint to whom he owes the inheritance of his faith. In the order of God's providence, the virtues and labours, the sufferings and endurance of one man continue to act upon countless generations. Perhaps in no part of Christendom is this more manifest than in Ireland. St. Patrick has had no successor in his apostolic office: fourteen hundred years ago he contracted his mystical espousals with the Church of Ireland, and no union of pastor and flock has ever been more fruitful, or gives better promise of endurance. During those ages Ireland has been convulsed and torn by internal and external enemies—or rather, we should say, by invaders so persistent that they came to be regarded as one with her inhabitants. Centuries of savage wars with Danes were soon followed by others scarcely less savage with Normans and Saxons; so that for a thousand years Ireland scarcely tasted the blessings of peace. Then came a time more fatal still to the moral character of a nation, for religion and law were converted into vile instruments of corruption and oppression; when, in the words of Sydney Smith, "such jobbing, such profligacy, so much direct tyranny and oppression, such an abuse of God's gifts, such profanation of God's name for the purposes of bigotry and party spirit, cannot be exceeded in the history of civilised Europe."*

At length in our own times peace was proclaimed in Ireland, and she had time to count her losses, and to estimate the ravages of those wars and social struggles which had all the deplorable consequences of civil strife.

She had much cause for mourning in the wild and lawless spirit of her children—the natural growth, in latter times, of their despairing surrender of all hope of even-handed legal justice. But at the same time she found a people second to none in the courage of its men and the purity of its women, those virtues by which nations live; and looking back into the dark and terrible past for the source of her life and the secret

* "Essays," p. 313.

of its endurance, she traced the preservation of hope, and of all that made life beautiful, to that religion which flowed like an unbroken river of light from the heart of the Apostle and Founder of her faith.

The clients of the Saint may therefore be pardoned if they find it hard to keep within the bounds of literary courtesy in dealing with those writers who, as we shall see, by their random and incoherent theories and flagrant misuse of ancient authorities, have tried to convert the history of St. Patrick into a theatre for the display of feats of historical legerdemain. For a long time Ireland has been deluged with such productions, which are an outrage at once to logic and common sense, to the Irish Church, and to the filial loyalty of the children of St. Patrick.

The work which we have set before us is to give our readers some idea of the character and value of the ancient *acta*, or records of St. Patrick, and of the evidence in support of the Catholic tradition regarding the Saint, as opposed to the Protestant view, which, we are sorry to say, has enlisted some Catholics amongst its supporters. Perhaps this will be done more satisfactorily if we consider, in the first place, the general objections which have been raised against the credibility of the records of the Saint. In this way, while our conclusions will come out more clearly, we may also hope to secure the attention of those who are at present inclined to regard the subject as hopelessly involved; and if our plan gives an appearance of vagueness to our preliminary remarks, it is to be hoped that this will be corrected by the conclusion.

We need not fear contradiction when we state that it is the common belief, not only in Ireland but all over the Christian world, that in the fifth century Ireland was rapidly and completely evangelised by St. Patrick, and that God, in sending him to preach the gospel, invested him with those supernatural powers which are usually attached to the plenitude of the apostolic office. Other saints, with less authentic testimony to their lives and work, reign in peace above our altars. Why is it, then, that controversy so rages around the name of St. Patrick? We unhesitatingly answer—because a host of modern writers have dealt with his life in a manner which, were it universal, would make short work not only with Saints' lives, but with a great part of secular biography.

The objections of the adversaries of the Catholic tradition may be classified under three heads:—

1. Discrepancies in the various lives and records of the Saint.
2. Number and character of his miracles.
3. His superhuman work.

In the first place, it is obvious that the more numerous

are the narratives concerning any person or event, the more there is reason to expect discrepancies: and if these narratives were written at various periods, and in different countries, and are preserved in old manuscripts, which have passed through the hands of many transcribers, we have still stronger reasons for anticipating confusion. All these difficulties meet us in the records of St. Patrick. Jocelyn, who wrote his life, A.D. 1185, tells us that, before his time, sixty-six different lives of the Saint had been written, most of which had been destroyed in the Danish invasions. Of these, six only have come down to us, and it is not certain that all these have been composed by natives of Ireland. Moreover, we have records of the Saint in several ancient annals of England and Gaul, as well as of Ireland. We have very little evidence as to the comparative value of his biographies, and we also know that the historic monuments of the world, during St. Patrick's time, and for some centuries after his death, were almost as chaotic as the times themselves. He was contemporary with Alaric, Attila, and Genseric in Italy; with Clovis and the Franks in Gaul; with the Saxon invasion of Britain; he was in relations with these three countries, and it will be time enough to try the several narratives of his long life by rigid principles of criticism, when "scientific history" shall have harmonised the records of this volcanic age. In the meantime, if they are chosen as a field for the exercise of what, in reference to these writers, O'Curry calls "critical pedantry,"* the ground soon gives way; but the disappearance of the critic does not compensate for the discredit cast upon the life of St. Patrick. It may also be observed that it is writers far from being competent to master ancient Irish manuscripts, who are boldest and most dogmatic in their theories, in which, however, they are carrying on a mere modern tradition with superficial and second-hand erudition. In this, as in all profound and intricate questions, we may measure a critic's attainments by his diffidence. Real scholars like O'Curry and Hennessy have avoided theories; they have left the Life of St. Patrick in its place as part of the ecclesiastical history of Ireland. It is on this that we mainly insist. Alone, in the midst of ruins, the Church of Ireland has preserved the integrity of her life and traditions: they are inseparably bound up with St. Patrick, and the fact that discrepancies are found where records are so numerous, only points to the necessity of adhering to those narratives which are in accordance with the traditions of the Church. A great part of the very best biographies must be taken on the faith of the writer: in

* "MS. Materials of Irish History," p. 342.

any life, however prominent, circumstances which are purely personal must stand by themselves; they cannot be balanced and checked like those great events which enter into a nation's life, and are corroborated by the concurrent testimony of all that makes up that life.

St. Patrick was sixty years of age when consecrated bishop by Pope St. Celestine, A.D. 432: and it is from that time that his public history begins. We cannot expect that the life of one residing as an ecclesiastical student, or simple priest, in various parts of Europe, could be accurately followed by the very imperfectly educated writers who composed the Saint's biographies. Some parts of his history can be tested and verified by collateral evidence, such as his connection with St. Martin of Tours, and St. Germanus of Auxerre. On these points the statements of the Irish writers are corroborated by the traditions of the church at Tours, and the testimony of the biographer of St. Germanus; but the wearisome discussions of Lanigau, Todd, and others on the incidents of travel, and the localities visited by St. Patrick, at this period of his life, have only served to mystify their readers. Again, although St. Patrick's life from the year 432 is both the starting point and the foundation of the history of the Church in Ireland, so far as it is supported and verified by her traditions; still, writers strain it too far when they try to make it bear the weight of the secular, as well as religious history of the period. The term "*Patrician literature*," now in common use, very aptly expresses the state of things as regards the life of the Saint. We take up some book on the subject, and at once we find ourselves, as it were, in a bazaar into which archæological disquisitions, genealogies, and the family histories of obscure individuals are imported. The vast and unexplored treasures of Irish antiquarian lore are a snare to writers who are inclined to prolixity, and a great part of the confusion in "*Patrician literature*" is to be attributed to the style of its writers: the Saint's own story is short and simple, when it is allowed to speak for itself.

If it occurs to the reader that up to this we have taken rather the line of apology than of argument, we are quite ready to plead guilty. In ancient Irish ecclesiastical history we sorely feel the want of an historian like Venerable Bede, one living near the times of which he wrote, and capable of welding into one the works of inferior writers. We regret that Irish archæology is still a virgin forest, penetrated by very few, who warn us that we may easily lose our way therein; but after all this is nothing more than the apology which has to be made for a great part of ancient history. In spite of the confidence of historians in themselves, and their authorities, oral tradition, and the logic

of a nation's common sense, will often have as much, or even more authority than critical investigations on ground which is unprepared. When, therefore, we take historical critics at their real value—when we find the unbroken history and tradition of the Church, which have a sequence and stability that no secular history can possess, with the *consensus* of successive generations of the faithful in Ireland, all bearing witness to St. Patrick—we come to the conclusion that the repeated assaults made on his history by modern writers must be attributed either to controversial or critical extravagance.

We believe in St. Patrick's history for the same reasons and with the same certainty as we believe in that of his relative and contemporary, St. Martin of Tours. Four Fathers of the Church have written lives of this great Saint; he was in constant relations with the most prominent personages of the age in Italy, Gaul, and at the court of the Emperor; yet we can arrive at hardly any chronological order as to the events of his life; even the date of his death is a matter of dispute, in which we find Tillemont and the Bollandists, with the traditions of the churches of Tours and Milan, arrayed against Baronius and others. Such imperfections have brought no discredit on the acts of St. Martin, and we may therefore claim the same toleration for those of St. Patrick.

The way in which even Catholic writers have assailed the acts of St. Patrick, on the score of the number and character of his miracles, affords another instance of the exceptional treatment which the Saint receives. Most of his miracles are precisely of the same character as those we find in the lives of other saints, under similar circumstances. He healed the sick, the blind, and the lame, and raised the dead; and, considering the results, we see no more reason for suspecting these things in St. Patrick's case than in that of any other apostolic saint. The resuscitation of the dead is the most astounding of miracles, and St. Patrick is said to have brought thirty-three persons to life. It is true that the evidence of these miracles was never juridically investigated; but neither their character nor number surprises us when we find twenty-four similar miracles proved at the canonization of St. Francis Xavier, as worked by the saint in his lifetime; while, as early as the year 1715, *twenty-seven* additional resurrections were recognized at Rome as obtained by the invocation of the saint.*

One of the latest writers on the life of St. Patrick, the Rev. J. O'Hanlon, is as unmeasured as Dr. Lanigan in his language concerning the "incredible fictions" and "fables" related in the

* Giry, "Vies des Saints," 3 Décembre.

ancient lives of St. Patrick. Jocelyn is the special object of his indignation. He characterizes his work as "better adapted for gratifying weak, ignorant, and imbecile minds, than for forming the religious sentiment or for improving the understanding of persons living in a critical or an enlightened age."* Yet he confesses that Jocelyn did little more than put into good Latin what he found in the most ancient sources. For our own part we are simple enough to rejoice that Jocelyn belonged to that school of biographers who have confidence in the discretion of their readers, and can trust them with an unvarnished narrative, free from moral reflections and warnings. His life of St. Patrick has been published by the Bollandists in the *Acta Sanctorum*; and we may gather from this that his work has found favour with the critical as well as the "imbecile"—more favour, probably, than if he had assumed the ambitious office of "forming the religious sentiment of his age."† Jocelyn tells us that he had carefully collected and reproduced matter which he found in the writings of the disciples and contemporaries of the Saint. They described what they themselves had seen, or received from credible witnesses. People whose first principles lead to the denial of supernatural interpositions and events, are unreasonably indignant; the old chroniclers did not write for such readers. It may also be added, that the results of St. Patrick's miracles are in accordance with the analogy of the faith. Like those of Christ and His Apostles, they have produced an immense and a divine revolution in every sphere of life in Ireland; and, if his biographers could defend themselves, they would probably say that so far as their writings have contributed to perpetuate early Christian traditions, and stamp the image of St. Patrick on the Irish people, they need not repent of the result. Irish Catholicity and the Apostle of Ireland have had more than their share of the scorn of the unbeliever. For centuries, like all things Irish, they have been out of court, and the insolent historical dogmatism of Gibbon and his school has had it all its own way, and still imposes upon many who ought to know better. Gibbon

* "Lives of Irish Saints," pp. 406, 407, 413, 415.

† Jocelyn's work, in many places, reads like a collection of evidence for a process of canonization, and it must not be supposed that the Bollandists were prepared to vouch for the truth of all the miraculous events which are recorded. Again, it is plain that the contemporary Irish biographers of the Saint had no more than second-hand information as to the circumstances of his life before his coming to Ireland: their evidence, therefore, regarding this part of his life is less cogent; but their records of St. Patrick's apostolate were written for readers, many of whom had been themselves witnesses of the events which are related.

was supremely ignorant of Celtic literature: he tells us—"In the dark and doubtful paths of Caledonian antiquity, I have chosen for my guides two learned and ingenious Highlanders." It is only necessary to say that one of these was James Macpherson, the "ingenious" fabricator of the Ossianic imposture.

Although knowing so little about the subject, or perhaps because of this, Gibbon does not hesitate to pass a sweeping judgment on the ecclesiastical historians of Ireland, as well as on her bards, whom he designates as the "two orders of men who equally abused the privilege of fiction."* Bards and monks are both honoured by the hostility of this writer. His sophistical ingenuity was at fault in supplying a theory to account for the great Celtic religious conquests of the sixth and seventh centuries; his policy, therefore, was to ignore or deny. A widespread revolution, carried out in many countries apparently without definite system or organization, and all the while preserving one type, growing into unity, and gathering wild and warring clans into the fold of Christ, was, humanly speaking, more inexplicable than the effects of the Edict of Constantine. This work was done without any extraordinary aids of intellect or wealth, or the co-operation of any universal temporal power, and, therefore, we all the more expect special signs of supernatural assistance; "one of the most cogent proofs of the miracles of Christ and His Apostles is drawn from their effects; it being inconceivable that a rival power to Cæsar should have started out of so obscure and ignorant a spot as Galilee, and have prevailed, without some such extraordinary and divine gifts."†

Considering the extent and rapidity of the results, it is surprising how any Catholic can have greater difficulties with the miracles of St. Patrick than with those of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, St. Antony, or St. Ambrose. The lives of these saints have been written by St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Athanasius, and Baronius; but the probability of the miracles recorded rests on other grounds than the names of their biographers. We claim, therefore, for St. Patrick's annalists nothing more than the respectful consideration granted to other narrators of similar events. It has been observed that there is a striking resemblance between the acts of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus and those of St. Patrick.‡ The struggles of St. Antony with the spirits of evil are quite as strange and unearthly as those of the Apostle of Ireland; while tradition attributes to St. Ambrose a

* Ch. xxv. s. 2.

† "Essays on Miracles," J. H. Newman, p. 232.

‡ Fr. Morris's "Life of St. Patrick," p. 8.

miracle similar to that recorded as having taken place at Tara, when the earth engulfed the blasphemous adversaries of the Gospel of Christ. Those Catholic writers, who seem to congratulate themselves on having put the biographers of St. Patrick in the pillory, would probably adopt a less triumphant tone if they recognized the logical consequences of their principles.

It remains to consider the third stumbling-block in the ancient records of the life of the Apostle of Ireland. Sir William Betham is astounded by what he styles the "almost ubiquity" of the Saint, and the Rev. J. F. Shearman thinks that he has found evidence of the same incredible exaggeration in the accounts of the journeys of St. Patrick throughout Ireland. "His presence," says this last-named writer, "in nearly every part of Ireland was represented as not only prolonged, but almost ubiquitous, as is indeed suggested by the author of the 'Tripartite Life,' as far at least as one province of Ireland is concerned;" and he quotes the following extract from this ancient biography in support of his statement: "The learned calculate that he (St. Patrick) made an offering on every seventh ridge that he traversed in Munster."† If Mr. Shearman had read the whole narrative of St. Patrick's mission in this province, he would have found that, so far from attributing ubiquity to the Saint, the writer tells us that he turned aside at this time, and did not visit West Munster.‡ There is nothing strange or incredible in the fact that St. Patrick offered up the Holy Sacrifice on every seventh hill in Munster, and it is very interesting to find in this incidental statement the probable origin of that devotion to the number seven which was afterwards so generally manifested in the religious foundations of the Irish Church.

Here, again, we find that if we set St. Patrick's work, like his miracles, against that of other Catholic saints, it falls quietly into its place. To return to St. Francis Xavier: St. Patrick gave sixty years to the work of the conversion of Ireland: St. Francis was only ten years in India, and when we take the map, and compare the geographical dimensions of Ireland with those of the countries in Hindostan, Malacca, and Japan, traversed and evangelized by the latter, it is evident that the palm of "ubiquity" rests with the Apostle of the Indies: for, at a moderate calculation, he probably went over ten times as much ground as St. Patrick.

* "Antiquarian Researches," p. 245.

† "Loca Patriciana," p. 396.

‡ See Mr. Hennessy's account of the existing local traditions verifying the statement of the ancient chronicle. Fr. Morris's "Life of St. Patrick," p. 115 n.

In this respect the life of St. Francis is a greater tax upon our faith than that of St. Patrick; it is the stability and endurance of St. Patrick's work which is his special glory. There have been ebblings and flowings in the religious life of Ireland; but St. Patrick has had no successor in his apostolic office. God gave him a life which was almost miraculously prolonged for the sake of his people.

He lived long enough to see the grey hairs on the heads of those whom he had baptised as children, so that he had time to organise and consolidate the infant Church, and to create a native clergy; works quite as difficult, perhaps, as the conversion of the nation. . . . Sixty years of ecclesiastical rule in Ireland gave St. Patrick time, not only to teach the faith, but to establish traditions. The rulers of the Church during this time were his own spiritual children, so while one generation passed away, and another succeeded, there was no change or disturbance in the life of that Church which had all its discipline, as well as its doctrines, from one man. The same prodigious power which in the beginning had broken all opposition, preserved unity and peace when the struggle was over, and made the fold of St. Patrick like the infant Church in Judea, where "the multitude of believers were of one heart and one mind." *

These general arguments, drawn from analogy, and supported by history and tradition, will probably satisfy all those who believe that supernatural events can have an historical foundation; but our work would be incomplete if we did not give the reader some idea of those writings in which the Catholic tradition is assailed.

If we select two, the "Memoir of St. Patrick," by Dr. Todd, and "Loca Patriciana," by the Rev. J. F. Shearman, it is not as regarding the theories of these writers as more formidable than those of Dr. Ledwich, Sir William Betham, and others, but because they come into the field with the accumulated sophistry of their predecessors. In their works, therefore, we may expect to find the sum and strength of those arguments which are supposed to relegate a great part of the personal history of the Apostle of Ireland to the province of nursery tales in the childhood of nations.

The compositions of these two writers are similar in form. Both have swelled their works with matter which hardly seems necessary for the discussion. In a summary of the history of the Irish Church during fourteen centuries, Dr. Todd leads us half way through his book before we are introduced to St. Patrick, and then it is in company with "the blessings" of the

* Fr. Morris, "Life of St. Patrick," p. 148.

hid 10100-200 up

Reformation, and the effects of the Legislative union.* In "Loca Patriciana" the space devoted to St. Patrick is even more limited, and the less there is to say about the Saint the more diffuse does the writer become. Thus in his account of St. Patrick's labours in Ossory, he tells us, "the materials out of which he must endeavour to write the early ecclesiastical history of Ossory are now very scanty and jejune,"† so they are supplemented by a history of Ossory down to the middle of the seventeenth century. The prolixity of these writers, however, has had one good result: it has led them on to give both sides of the question, whenever they have fairly grappled with St. Patrick's history, and the consequence is that they have answered their own arguments. This is as might be expected: they have attempted to write history in glaring contradiction with those ancient records which are the sole materials at their disposal. In adopting so original a line as this, the prudent course would have been to give up authorities altogether. "Patrician history," Mr. Shearman tells us, "is a difficult subject to take in hand and to treat in an independent way without disturbing, to some extent, the old and fossilised ideas of the past centuries" (Pref. p. vii.). It would perhaps be more correct to say that it is not merely "difficult" but impossible to treat the history of fourteen hundred years ago in an "independent" manner. Niebuhr has been accused of going too far when he speaks of historical "divination," although he meant nothing more than a faculty in an historian similar to that which enabled Columbus to divine that a new world was to be found in the West. Given certain data, he says, the real historian can arrive at others unknown; but the independent historian appears to be one who can get on without any data at all, like M. Renan or Mr. Froude.

As to the "fossilised" condition of the acts of St. Patrick, we take this to be no slight evidence of their veracity. In the world of ideas it is facts that are certain, and undisputed, which usually assume this consistent and permanent form. Ancient Irish, Saxon, Norman, and even Danish traditions‡ are one on the subject of St. Patrick, for the very obvious reason that there was no other.

It is not an easy matter to give an account of Dr. Todd's

* "Memoir," p. 244.

† "Loca Patriciana," p. 265.

‡ Invoked by the Danes as "Archbishop and head of the Saints of Erin." McFiris, "Fragments of Irish Annals, A.D. 851." It is evident that Shakespeare had evidence of a popular devotion to St. Patrick amongst the Danes in Catholic times, since we find him introducing Hamlet as swearing "By St. Patrick."

theories and arguments. The difficulty arises from the fact that evidently he had no clear grasp of them himself. He is well known as an author of considerable ability, and of varied, if not profound learning. The most important half of his work, in fact the whole of the actual "Memoir" of St. Patrick, was brought out under the "supervision"* of Dean Reeves, the learned editor of the "Life of St. Columba," and the result of their labours has been to produce a work which so often evaporates in vague assumptions and contradictions, that its only real importance in the present controversy arises from the evidence which it bears to the vital and avenging power of the truth. It is to the credit of Dr. Todd's logic that it proves too strong for his prejudices, as will be seen when we contrast his language in support of his own views with those parts of his work in which he bears witness to the Catholic tradition.

He set himself to prove that St. Patrick was not a Catholic Saint, that he had no mission from Rome, and that a great part of the work attributed to him was not his own. Dr. Todd had satisfied himself that St. Patrick was not a Catholic saint, the next step was to make him a Protestant bishop, and his efforts to naturalise the Elias-like Apostle of Ireland are very amusing. "He believed, no doubt, that his call was supernatural, and that he had seen visions and dreamt dreams," like "other well-meaning and excellent men," but he compensated for this weakness by the fact that "by his judicious management the Christianity which he founded became self-supporting." Again, he appears to have discovered that, like the English in India, St. Patrick was a model of toleration in the face of the abominations of heathenism. "He dealt *tenderly* with their usages and prejudices. Although he *sometimes* felt it necessary to overturn their idols, and on some occasions risked his life, he was guilty of no offensive or unnecessary iconoclasm."†

In a similarly embarrassed style, which reveals his sense of the uncertainty of his ground, he approaches the subject of St. Patrick's mission from Rome. "It *seems probable* that the Irish biographers of St. Patrick *felt themselves compelled* to shorten the life of Palladius, in order to make room for the new commission to succeed him which they assume to have been given to St. Patrick by Pope Celestine. . . . *There is reason to believe*, therefore, that national vanity and national prejudice have corrupted this part of the history."‡ As it is evident that his arguments on this point produce so very dubious an assent in the writer's own mind, it seems quite unnecessary

* "Preface," p. x.

† Pp. 378, 514. (The italics are our own.)

‡ P. 303.

to consider them here, especially as this point has been taken out of the sphere of controversy since the appearance of Bishop Moran's "Essays on the Early Irish Church."

Dr. Todd's assault on the tradition—so incredible to a Protestant—that Ireland was completely converted by St. Patrick, supplies us with a striking example of the way in which outraged authorities recoil on irreverent investigators. He tells us (p. 502) that "there were many districts and tribes of Ireland where the teaching of St. Patrick was rejected;" but his only proofs are the facts that the *one* tribe of the Hi Garchon, *in the first instance*, resisted the Saint on his arrival in Ireland, and the following passage from the "Book of Armagh":—"Quid video dissertores, et archiclocos et milites Hiberniæ, quoa odio habent paruchiam Patricii, quia substraxerunt ab eo quoa ipsius erat: timentque quoniam si quæreretur heres Patricii paruchiam illius, potest pene totam insolam (*sic*) sibi reddere in paruchiam quam Deus dedit illi."* In the next page he goes on to say that "many passages in the 'Book of Armagh' afford undoubted proof that *all* Ireland did not submit to St. Patrick's influence."

It is quite inconceivable that the quaintness of the Latin in the above extract could have hidden its real import from Dr. Todd. In reality, it supplies us with a very striking proof of the truth of the Catholic tradition.

At the time when the author Tirechan wrote—that is, about a century and a half after the death of St. Patrick—so strong, he tells us, was the belief that the whole island had become the diocese (paruchia) of St. Patrick, that many dreaded lest the Archbishop of Armagh (heres Patricii) should aspire to an equally unlimited jurisdiction. As to the other passages in the "Book of Armagh" to which Dr. Todd refers, as he has given no references, we can only judge of their import by the one specimen with which he has favoured us.

We will now give some extracts from Dr. Todd in which he appears in a very different character, as the enthusiastic advocate of the Catholic tradition, and the triumphant destroyer of his own sceptical theories. His preface was written when his work was completed, and in it we find the result produced on the author's mind by his own investigations. His language assumes all at once the vigour of conviction. The timid interposition of "it seems probable," "it may be conjectured," &c., are no longer needed in his text, as in bold and forcible language he animadverts on those "writers strongly prejudiced by party feeling, and wholly ignorant of the original sources of

* P. 502.

the history," who have cast doubts on the existence of St. Patrick, and continues thus:—

The traditions collected in the "Book of Armagh" cannot be later than the third half-century after the date usually assigned to the death of St. Patrick. . . . They assume the existence of St. Patrick, as admitted by all parties and never questioned. Had the story of St. Patrick been of but recent origin, some remarks or legends in the collection would certainly have betrayed the fact. That the collectors of these traditions indulged in the unscrupulous use of legend strengthens the argument. There were men alive at the time whose grandfathers might have conversed with disciples of the Patrick, who was said to have converted the Irish in the latter half of the fifth century. Had the existence of this Patrick been a thing to be proved, or ever doubted, some of these men would have been produced as witnesses, and made to tell their experience; but in the whole of this curious record there is not a hint dropped capable of giving support to the hypothesis that the history of Patrick was then a recently invented fable. Had it been so, the resistance to the claims of Armagh could not fail to have brought out some allusion to the fact. It is incredible that a whole nation could have combined thus to deceive themselves; and it is even more incredible that a purely mythological personage should have left upon a whole nation so indelible an impression of imaginary services; an impression which continues to the present day, in their fireside lore, their local traditions, their warm-hearted devotion and gratitude, which has left also its lasting memorial in the ancient names of hills and headlands, towns and villages, churches and monasteries, throughout the country.*

By "unscrupulous use of legend," we presume Dr. Todd means the plain narrative of supernatural events, and, omitting this sentence, we have little to add to his argument. It is evident that "resistance to the claims of Armagh," whose Archbishop reigned and urged his rights as "heir of Patrick," would also have exploded any spurious theories regarding "the Roman Mission, and the universal apostolate of St. Patrick," had these been "recently invented fables."

The evidence we possess of the rigid scrutiny to which the claims of Armagh were subjected, so soon after the death of St. Patrick, is equally conclusive as an argument against the theory of the Rev. J. F. Shearman. We have already remarked that prolixity, the fertile parent of confusion and fallacies, is a distinguishing feature of "*Loca Patriciana*," as well as of the "*Memoir of St. Patrick*." In other respects, however, these works are very different in their character. Dr. Todd is so diffident and apologetic about his own theories, and so enthusiastic in his acknowledgments of the force of the Catholic

* "*Memoir of St. Patrick*," Preface, p. v.

tradition, that at times we can hail him as one of our supporters. Moreover, he is generally clear and scrupulously exact in his references, even when they are absolutely subversive of his own argument. We are sorry that we cannot say the same of Mr. Shearman. As we shall see, this writer manifests as little respect for "old and fossilised" authorities as for ideas in a similar condition, and adopts a style of quotation which in many places almost baffles investigation. If we cannot call his theory more baseless and visionary than the theories of Sir William Betham and Dr. Todd, it is because they are all three substantially identical. St. Patrick in history is as great a puzzle to the critic as his children are nowadays to the politician. The idea of a Saint supreme in the political and intellectual, as well as the moral order, seems to put history out of joint, as completely as the supremacy of the supernatural bewilders the mind of an ordinary statesman. Modern critics, therefore, have set to work to pull St. Patrick to pieces, in the hope of reconstructing him in a modified form on scientific principles: they are welcome to do so, if they can; we only ask for proof as well as affirmation.

The author of "*Loca Patriciana*" tells us (p. 396) that in the process of compiling his work he was impressed with "the great difficulty, if not impossibility, of one person being competent to endure all the labours attributed to St. Patrick." Later on (at p. 434) he gives us his solution of the mystery: "The old writers who took the literary remains of the third Patrick as the exponent and counterpart of his history, which, in fact, belonged to Sen Patrick, shut out from view the *real* Apostle Sen Patrick, consigning him to obscurity and an almost historical extinction." But he tells us in the same page, that were those "literary remains"—that is, the "*Confessio*" and the "*Epistle to Coroticus*"—either lost or unwritten, very little more of the third Patrick would be known than his coming to Ireland in 440, his being the *daltha* or pupil of Sen Patrick, and his death in 493. Therefore, he does no more than transfer "all the labours" to his newly discovered Apostle, and this, too, with an immense aggravation of the load, as he supposes the work to have been done in *twenty-nine years*, instead of the sixty years which ancient writers allow for the Apostolic career of St. Patrick.

This "independent" theory, however, makes several very exaggerated demands upon our credulity. In the first place, we are called on to throw over the aboriginal authorities for the sake of the modern critic; and then to assume, either that the whole Irish Church and nation conspired to extinguish the memory of St. Patrick, or that they suddenly and completely

lost sight of the Father and Founder of their Faith, and unconsciously transferred their devotion and allegiance to a person so obscure, that little or nothing was known about him except what he had said of himself. It should also be observed that this substitution is supposed to have taken place, not in an age of mental or religious apathy, but at the very time when the faith inherited from St. Patrick was in its full meridian splendour, supreme in its influence over the intellects as well as over the hearts of the people of Ireland.

In the DUBLIN REVIEW of October, 1879, p. 547, there appeared a short notice of this theory. The introduction of Palladius, or "Patricius Primus," into the discussion was shown to be quite foreign to the writer's argument: he has no fault to find with ancient authorities on the score of Palladius,* and therefore the confusion created by the mention of a *third* claimant can only be regarded as a gratuitous outrage offered to the Apostle of Ireland. The sum of Mr. Shearman's theory is to be found in the extracts given above. When, however, his statements regarding his second and third Patricks were set against each other in parallel columns, it at once became manifest that by a singular hallucination he had been describing *one* St. Patrick under two aspects, visible only to himself. In fact, he was convicted of the very enormity which he attributes to the venerable ecclesiastical historians of his country. Thus, Mr. Shearman's "Patricius Secundus" has already gone the way of the prehistoric Patrick of Betham, the Palladian Patrick of Todd, and other modern Celtic myths as shortlived as the Ossianic imposture of Gibbon's "ingenious Highlander." It is also easy to show that Mr. Shearman's chief adversary is St. Patrick himself, in those "literary remains" where *defunctus adhuc loquitur*, and therefore it would be unnecessary to go further in refuting his theory, were it not of importance to lay bare the tactics of this school of writers, who have hitherto been so irrepressible that we cannot hope that we have yet done with them.

The steps of a laboured historical investigation which have led to so singular a result, will at any rate interest us by their originality. Indeed, the following announcement in the preface (p. vii.) prepares us for something novel and surprising:—

In taking, perhaps (says Mr. Shearman), a wider scope of observation than preceding writers on the Patrician era, the present essayist,

* P. 411.

† It must be borne in mind that Mr. Shearman does not venture to question the authority of these writings. See "*Loca Patriciana*," pp. 399, 440, 447.

drifting away from the accustomed moorings, striking out new lines for himself, and leaving the well-known tracks of former inquirers, may appear to have been rash and daring; he is, nevertheless, fully persuaded that most of his views, when examined by unbiassed and well-read students of Patrician history, will find a cordial acceptance.

We have already seen what this author's sentiments are on the subject of "independent" history, and the above extract reveals the manner in which he avails himself of his liberty.

When he recommends his work to "well-read students of Patrician history," we find that he is making no slight demand on their time and benevolence, for, at p. vi. of his preface we observe the following statement: "The early records of North Britain, Cambria, and Armorica have been to some extent investigated in relation to our native history;" but at p. viii. he adds, "The author has to record his regret that some of the early parts of '*Loca Patriciana*' were written before he read the valuable works of Mr. W. F. Skene on early Scottish history. His investigations and studies were chiefly made in the loose and uncritical writings of the Welsh historians of the last century." As a compensation for the defects of his own work he adds that "a reference to the accurate and learned volumes of Mr. W. F. Skene will fill up the lacunæ, and will correct omissions or pleonasms both in the text and genealogies." Mr. Skene has written many volumes, and it is important that we should be informed of the exact titles of those to which the writer refers, as it is well known that the learned author of "*Celtic Scotland*" has been convicted of many serious blunders in matters relating to early Scottish or Irish literature. Like some other modern historians, Mr. Skene has been wanting in respect for antiquity, which has had its revenge; he has attempted to exalt Scotland at the expense of that "*Scotia Major*" from which she has borrowed her name and language: this vicious bias has infected a great part of his writings, and involved him in many erroneous and absurd conclusions.

The fact is, we can dispense as well with Mr. Skene's Scottish, as with his Welsh erudition: it is accuracy in Irish history that we want, and we are sorry to say that this seems quite a secondary matter in the pages of "*Loca Patriciana*." Bishop Moran has called attention to the caution requisite in accepting Mr. Shearman's references.* This is not surprising if we consider the incongruous character of the authorities which he has made use of in his dissertation. At p. 413 we read (the *italics* are our own):—

The Chronological Synopsis, referring to the second and third

* DUBLIN REVIEW, April, 1880, p. 327.

Patricks, is designed to show their personal distinction, and the leading events in their career. *Some dates* in these tables are adopted from *some* ancient annals in the Leabhar Breac. . . . *Some others are merely inferential*, and a few only are suggested from *some legendary notices* of St. Patrick. They do not, however, *interfere* with the leading and well authenticated epochs marked in these tables. *This diversity of dates clearly indicates* the existence of two missionaries called Patrick, whose lives were nearly contemporaneous, and *yet so individualized as to appear quite distinct* from the first missionary Palladius, or Patricius, as he was called by another name.

The writer has certainly fulfilled the promise of his preface, and taken "a wider scope of observation than preceding writers on the Patrician era." If he merely proposed to amuse us with an historical conundrum woven together from dates, some "inferential," and others suggested by "legendary notices," such as are found in the Ossianic poems, &c., we should not complain, but it is too much for our patience when we find that the very gravest authorities in ancient Irish history receive no better treatment than this at the hands of Mr. Shearman. Thus at p. 401, we read as follows: "The 'Book of Armagh' names two Patricii; 1st, Palladius, alio nomine Patricius, and in the same paragraph, Patricius secundus, his successor, who is evidently the same person as Sen Patrick." Then at p. 408 we find the text on which this statement is grounded.

Palladius episcopus primo mittitur, qui Patricius alio nomine appellabatur, qui martyrium passus est apud Scottos, at tradunt sancti antiqui. Deinde Patricius secundus ab angelo Dei Victor nomine, et a Celestino Papa mittitur, cui Hibernia tota creditur qui eam pene totam baptizavit.*

Palladius the bishop is first sent, who by another name was called Patricius, who suffered martyrdom amongst the Scots as ancient saints relate. Then Patricius the second is sent by the angel of God, named Victor, and by Pope Celestine, in whom all Hibernia believed, and who baptized almost the whole of it.

This account of the conversion of Ireland was written certainly not more than a hundred and fifty years after the death of St. Patrick: the distinction between Palladius and the acknowledged Apostle of Ireland is clearly drawn out: the narrative is found in a book ever regarded as sacred in Ireland, because of the tradition that the copy of the "Confession" it contains was written by St. Patrick himself. The authors, St. Ultan and Tirechan, make no allusion to the supposed third Patrick, whose "literary remains" were before their eyes: they mention the second Patrick; but in their records he is

* "Lib. Arm.," fol. 16, aa.; and Todd's "Memoir," p. 289.

second, with no successor, as regards his Apostolic office, and yet we are told that, in the mind of the old chroniclers, he was "evidently" the intermediate Patricius Secundus, or Sen Patrick of "*Loca Patriciana*."

In the following extract, to be found at p. 433, we have a more elaborate specimen of the results produced by "*inferential*" dates, when treated by an "*independent*" historian:—

The truth is, that Sen Patrick, the Cambrian or second Patrick, attained the age of eighty-five years, and the Albanian or third Patrick, MacCalphurn, died in his eighty-third year. The chronology of the following writers, founded on his supposed longevity of one hundred and twenty years, thus fixes the dates of his birth and decease: "*Stanhurst*," 352–472; "*Henry Marlborough*," 376–499; "*Giraldus Cambrensis*," 338–458; "*Florence of Worcester*," 372–493; "*Jocelyn*," 370–493; "*William of Malmesbury*," 361–472; "*Probus*," 361–493; "*Annals of Connought*," 336–456; "*Annals of Ulster*," 341–461; "*Tigernach*," 341–(461?); "*Ninnii Scholastes*," 352–(462?).

Having made up his mind that the "*real Apostle*" has been "*shut out from view*" by ancient writers, Mr. Shearman sets to work to make them confess their fault, and boldly appends this note to his "*chronology of the acta*" of his resuscitated Apostle Sen Patrick. The authorities quoted in his long *catena* are of very unequal value, indeed some cannot be called authorities at all, yet we observe that, one and all, they bring their testimony against the cardinal point of Mr. Shearman's theory, in which he divides the term of St. Patrick's career in order to make room for another. We also remark that, while he starts with two St. Patricks, he gradually lapses into discussing "the supposed longevity" of *one*: Patrick, the son of Calphurn, whom he styles in the same place "*the St. Patrick of popular history*," as if he were not at the same time the one whom the Church has ever honoured.

This extraordinary assortment of authors, from the pen of a professedly critical writer, without an attempt at discrimination, is a characteristic specimen of sceptical "*Patrician literature*." As to the foreign writers quoted, we may dismiss them at once. Jocelyn and Probus give no dates; they are entirely "*inferential*" on the part of Mr. Shearman. We need only, therefore, notice those Irish annals which give the order of events chronologically. Of these, the *Annals of Connacht* may be also put aside: either this writer has been betrayed by his copyists, or we must suppose that he was as wild in his "*Patrician*" chronology as Giraldus Cambrensis himself.

Thus we find ourselves face to face with the only two authorities in the list which are worthy of the name on a question of dates, and this apparently is also well understood by Mr.

Shearman. His mode of dealing with these authors is quite unpardonable. His theory obliges him to fix the death of his Apostle Sen Patrick at the year 458 or 461, and therefore he tries to force Tighernach and the Annals of Ulster into making a similar statement. If the Father of Irish Annals, and the Annals of Ulster, whose accuracy is so universally acknowledged, were found to be at fault regarding the identity of St. Patrick, it would certainly be a serious difficulty. We shall now see what are the real facts.

The venerable ecclesiastic Sen, or old Patrick, whom we are now expected to honour as Apostle of Ireland, was one of St. Patrick's attendants. In an ancient record quoted by Mr. Shearman he is styled "*Caput sapientum seniorum ejus*," a dignity probably equivalent to a modern provost of a chapter.* He is not mentioned at all by Tighernach, so far as we know, for there is a *hiatus* in the MS. from 388, the date of St. Patrick's captivity, to 490, three years before his death. At this date Tighernach begins again, and under the year 493 thus records the Apostle's death: "Patrick, Archbishop and Apostle of the Irish, went to his rest on the 17th day of March, in the 120th year of his age." It is also remarkable that in this place he quotes an ancient Irish poem in which the Saint is styled the first Apostle—"Primus Apostolus." However, as some leaves in the MS. have been misplaced, and the marginal dates of St. Patrick's birth and captivity incorrectly noted,† these imperfections, with the *hiatus*, have evidently encouraged Mr. Shearman to overrule the plain statement of Tighernach himself.

The Annals of Ulster are equally explicit. Under the year 457 we find this entry—"Death of Sen Patrick, as some writers say;" and again, at 461—"At this time others fix the death of Patrick." The writer is evidently referring to the same obscure personage, the date of whose death he is unable to verify. But the record in these Annals of the death of the real Apostle leaves no doubt either as to time or identity. At the year 493 we read: "Patrick, Archbishop and Apostle of the Irish, went to his rest on the 17th March, in the 120th year of his age, sixty years after his coming to Hibernia to baptize the Irish."[‡] In the face of this entry Mr. Shearman tells us that these Annals place the death of the real Apostle of Ireland in 461, one of the dates given for the demise of Sen Patrick. It is true that Mr. Shearman has attached *notes of interrogation* to some of the quo-

* P. 433. The obvious sense of this passage has escaped Mr. Shearman: it implies an office under a superior.

† O'Curry's "MS. Materials of Irish History," p. 64.

‡ The Four Masters also fix the death of St. Patrick at A.D. 493.

tations : these ought to be more general, as we presume that by this singular use of authorities, the writer wishes to remind his readers of the request made in his preface, that they should themselves "fill up the lacunæ" and "correct the omissions and pleonasm" of "*Loca Patriciana*."

We hope that we have now made some way in proving that, if modern critics have succeeded in raising doubts about St. Patrick, their success cannot be attributed either to their logic or historical accuracy. Extracts similar to those we have given might be indefinitely multiplied. If we may again borrow the forcible language of Dr. Todd, "garbled quotations," "misinterpreted authorities," "premises from which the conclusions deduced do not follow," and "conclusions deduced from no premises at all," are the characteristics of the sceptical Patrician school. Unfortunately, Dr. Todd himself has not escaped the contagion of that general mental insobriety which shows itself in seeing one St. Patrick double. He was probably betrayed by the indiscriminate indulgence which has been so freely granted to those who have condescended to notice St. Patrick. Any allusion to the Saint seems to be regarded, in some quarters, as a compliment, even when it amounts to nothing more than telling him to get out of the way, and if anything that we have written appears uncourteous to our opponents, we hope that this will be attributed to our conviction that either St. Patrick or his critics must be sacrificed.

It only remains to give a brief account of the most important ancient records of St. Patrick.

In the first rank we must place the Saint's Confession and Epistle to Coroticus, writings admitted to be his genuine compositions by every authority whose opinion on the subject is of any value. Even Dr. Todd ventures to say of the Confession that "it contains nothing inconsistent with the century in which it professes to have been written."* Indeed, if we consider the weight of the authorities whom he quotes in the same page in favour of the authenticity of this tract, as well as the Epistle, including Ussher, Ware, Cave, Spelman, Tillemont, Mabillon, D'Achery, Martene, Du Cange, Bollandus, &c., it appears that it would be hard to find any ancient documents in a position more impregnable to criticism. These tracts form, unquestionably, the most authoritative and interesting part of the acts of St. Patrick. In them we have his own statement that he did the work which history and tradition attribute to him. There is a power in transparent simplicity and sincerity which carries conviction with it, and makes one man's words better than the

* "*Apostle of Ireland*," p. 347.

evidence of a thousand witnesses. Protestants as well as Catholics have felt and acknowledged this in studying the writings of St. Patrick, so that we find the enthusiastic language of Tillemont repeated in the pages of Dr. Todd.* That the character of St. Patrick passed unscathed through the crucible of Tillemont's criticism has been justly regarded as convincing evidence of its conformity with those of the Fathers of the Church. Tillemont's Jansenistical spirit, joined to his intimate acquaintance with the spirit and genius of the primitive Church, may be said to have made him eminently an *advocatus diaboli*, in that species of process of canonization to which Catholic criticism has subjected St. Patrick. He tells us that the result of his study of the writings of St. Patrick was the conclusion, that they were the clear manifestation of a soul so superhuman, that he did not hesitate to compare him to the inspired Prophets and Apostles, rather than to more modern Saints.†

In these writings of St. Patrick we find, in the first place, a revelation of a supernatural character fully in keeping with the extraordinary life and work which his biographers have recorded. The man was as far exalted above ordinary mortals as his actions exceeded those of other men: and secondly, we have apparently accidental allusions to his own supernatural life from his early youth, and to the results of his apostolate. Like all the Saints, he tries to suppress and hide himself, but in vain. He does not give a catalogue of his miracles; and, absurdly enough, this has been alleged in argument against them; but he tells us plainly of the work which he accomplished. In his Confession he makes no allusion to any pre-existing Christianity in Ireland—which of itself would be sufficient to refute Mr. Shearman's theory—and pours forth his soul in thanksgiving to God for the grace given to him that "a mighty multitude should be born to God and made perfect through me, and that a clergy should everywhere be ordained for a people newly born in the faith" (s. 16). He goes on to say: "Wherefore, in Ireland, those who never had the knowledge of God, and up to this time worshipped nothing but idols and unclean things, have lately become the people of the Lord, and are called the sons of God" (s. 18). The Epistle to Coroticus bears witness to the same fact. It begins thus: "I, Patrick, an unlearned sinner, have been appointed Bishop in Ireland; I take it for certain that from God I have received that which I am." And then he goes on to speak of the "in-

* "Memoir," p. 383.

† "Hist. Eccl." vol. xvi. p. 455.

numerable (innumeros) Christians" whom he had "begotten in God and confirmed in Christ." Here, as well as in the Confession, he assumes as a fact perfectly well known to those for whom he wrote, that he had been sent to continue the work of the Apostles—that is, to found a Christian Church in a heathen country. Wherefore, in the Confession, he says:—

I never faint in giving thanks to my God, who has guarded my fidelity in the time of my temptation, so that this day I can fearlessly offer Him sacrifice, and I consecrate my soul as a living victim to my Lord who has saved me from all my trials, so that I may say: Who am I, or what is my prayer, O Lord! who hast disclosed to me such signs of Thy Divinity? So that this day I can exalt and magnify Thy name in every place, as well in adversity as in prosperity, and receive without trouble whatever comes, whether it be good or evil, ever giving thanks to God, who has taught me that I should ever believe in Him without doubting: and who has heard me, so that in those last days I had confidence to undertake a work so holy and so wonderful, and imitate those of whom it was of old predicted by the Lord, that they should announce His gospel as a testimony to all nations before the end of the world. Which, as we see, has been fulfilled. Behold we are witnesses that the gospel has been preached every where, even to the furthest limits of the habitations of men (s. 14).

Our object in these quotations is to show that all those who attempt to deny the greatness of St. Patrick's work, or to divide his glory with others, are thereby driven to reject those writings of the Saint, which hitherto have never been questioned by anyone whose opinion is worthy of serious attention. They may quote and profess to respect them; but in their case this is no more than that conventional homage which some people pay to the Bible while denying its inspiration.

The Confession and Epistle of St. Patrick are primarily historical, but at the same time they are a manifestation of the dealings of God with a soul which was the theatre of the most sublime operations of grace, and if some passages are difficult to understand, the obscurity must be attributed to the supernatural character of these writings, which, in many places, deal with questions beyond the reach of human language.

They are mystical in the highest sense of the word, and it is this combination of the mystic and the Apostle which gives to St. Patrick's character so striking a resemblance to that of St. Paul; a resemblance which has forced itself on the minds even of those who are blind to the evidence of his supernatural gifts.

No one who carefully compares these writings with Mr. Aubrey De Vere's *Legends of St. Patrick*, can fail to see that the sublime conception of the poet is a faithful expression of the

Saint's autobiography. It is this fidelity to the original which gives its special value to Mr. De Vere's work. To understand and worthily to describe the Saint, it needed a writer kindred in faith and spirit. Mr. De Vere's St. Patrick appeals to Catholic instincts like Dante's St. Francis or the Madonnas of Fra Angelico. At the same time there is no impression of exaggeration left on the mind of the reader. The poet cannot soar higher than his theme. In his account of the Devotional Poetry of Spain, Longfellow remarks, "when imagination spreads its wings in the bright regions of devotional song—in the pure empyrean—judgment should direct its course, but there is no danger of its soaring too high." As regards heroic personal sanctity, these principles can only be applied to Catholic Saints. Imagination droops its wing, and genius is dumb in the presence of characters such as Luther or Henry VIII. Had St. Patrick been one of the vulgar sort, or his acts a piece of clumsy patchwork, as superficial writers have supposed, De Vere could have made nothing of him. The inspiration of the Catholic poet flowed from his subject; from the life and character; the invisible presence of one belonging to that hierarchy of the Saints who are the light of the world because they reflect the beauty and the truth of God.

St. Patrick's writings bear the inimitable stamp of sanctity. In every page we seem to see the living Saint, one "suffering divine things," dizzy and as it were amazed by the greatness of divine visitations, trying in vain to hide them, and then turning to creatures to find a vent for that fire from heaven with which he was consumed, crowned by that humility which is so graceful and eloquent in the Saints because of its simplicity. Lastly, although the Saint does not give a narrative of his own miracles, he plainly alludes to them as things publicly known, when he speaks of those "signs and wonders which the Lord hath shown to me many years before they came to pass, as He has known all things before the beginning of time." (Conf. s. 20). But enough has now been done for our argument as drawn from St. Patrick's writings. Therein we have evidence that when he came to Ireland it was a heathen country; that he possessed all the supernatural credentials of a mission from God, and that in his time the nation was converted to Christianity "even to the farthest limits of the habitations of men."

As this paper aims at nothing more recondite than an appeal from illogical pedantry to history and common sense, a short account of the most important sources of St. Patrick's history is all that our argument requires.

Regarded as literary compositions, the ancient records of St. Patrick are very rude and imperfect productions, and it is

manifest that this is in itself a strong evidence of their antiquity. The use of the old Itala version of the Scriptures in St. Patrick's writings, and his allusion to the Franks as Pagan in his time, is scarcely a more convincing proof of authenticity than that afforded by the simple style, and barbarous Latin of the Tripartite Life. It is precisely the sort of work to be expected from a writer such as we may suppose its reputed author, St. Evin, to have been. O'Curry considers it very probable that he was a contemporary of St. Patrick,* and therefore a convert from Paganism. The gift of faith does not imply a knowledge of mystical theology, so it is no dishonour to St. Evin to suppose, that although competent to narrate the circumstances of St. Patrick's mission, he was at the same time incapable of describing in appropriate language those manifestations of supernatural power which were brought under his observation. O'Curry also remarks that there is good reason to believe that those lives of St. Patrick, "said to have been written by Colum Cillé, Ultan, Adamnan and others, were primarily drawn from this composition," and that "There can be little doubt that the short sketch of St. Patrick's life written into the Book of Armagh, was taken from this tract."† Subsequent biographers did little more than reproduce the raw material as found in the Tripartite Life, which was evidently regarded with a sort of religious veneration as being the work of one of St. Patrick's disciples. It is difficult in any other way to explain the importance attributed to so rude a composition in ages when Ireland was distinguished for her learning and literary activity.

When, therefore, we have studied the Tripartite Life, we have got the key to all the ancient biographies of St. Patrick, and if it be true that the narrative is at times uncouth and disconnected, still running through its pages, we can trace one unbroken golden thread in the sublime and inimitable individuality of St. Patrick. There is a sense in which it is quite true that old writers must have taken the "literary remains" of St. Patrick as the "exponent and counterpart" of his history. The personality is identical in both. But the supposition that the biography of another man, has fortuitously coalesced, or been fraudulently dovetailed with the autobiography of St. Patrick, is in some respects more extravagant than the theory that the dramas of Shakspeare were the creation of a motley horde of playwrights. It may be said that Shakspeare was not known till after his death, so the myth, in the expressive language of Mr. Shearman, would have had time to "fossilize." But from

* "MS. Materials," p. 351.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 347-351
G 2

the day in the year of grace 432, when St. Patrick, for the second time, set foot in Ireland, he has been the central and imperial figure of her history. As Apostle, Archbishop, and Legislator, religion and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, laws and national customs originated with him, and pay that universal tribute to his memory, which, as cumulative evidence, is as strong as it is treacherous to illogical and narrow-minded inquirers. In Ireland, during fourteen centuries the faith which St. Patrick taught has been the animating principle of the nation's life. Those Pagan glories which inspired the poetry of Ossian and her bards, were insular and insignificant compared with the splendours of that age when Ireland was the sanctuary and the university of the Christian world. Three hundred years after St. Patrick's death, the Christian poet Aengus Céilé Dé, in his Féiliré, or metrical martyrology, thus celebrates the triumphs of the Cross over Paganism—

Tara has become abandoned and desert under the vainglory of its kings, while Armagh remains the populous seat of dignity, piety, and learning; Cruachain, the royal residence of the kings of Connacht, is deserted, while Clonmacnois resounds with the dashing of chariots and the tramp of multitudes, to honour the shrine of St. Ciaran; the royal palace of Aillinn, in Leinster, has passed away, while the church of St. Brigid at Kildare, remains in dazzling splendour; Emania, the royal palace of Ulster, has disappeared, while the holy Coemghin's church at Gleann-da-Locha, remains in full glory; the Monarch Laeghairé's pride and pomp are extinguished, while St. Patrick's name continues to shine with growing lustre.*

When, therefore, we sum up the proofs in support of our argument, the evidence supplied by the ancient Annals of Ireland, the biographies of the Saint, the universal and local traditions of a people singularly tenacious in such matters, the inimitable stamp of a Divine Apostolic mission impressed on the character, and revealed by the writings of St. Patrick, crowned by the testimony of that Church which distinguishes her own in the past as infallibly as in the present; it may, perhaps, be objected that our case is too clear, and that under such circumstances it is inconceivable that so much scepticism should exist in the minds of reasonable men.

If the controversy about St. Patrick had been purely literary and speculative, this would certainly be hard to understand; but, from the way in which it has been carried on, it is plain that it has derived much of its life and energy from political and sectarian considerations, and from the fact that the patronage

* O'Curry, "MS. Materials," p. 367.

of St. Patrick's name carried with it rights to broad lands and rich endowments.

Another reason for the persistent assaults made on the acts of St. Patrick is to be found in the prominence given to the Saint in ancient Irish records of the fifth century. He cannot be ignored ; but, at the same time, all the authentic sources of his history are inseparably bound up with accounts of his supernatural powers and miraculous gifts. Writers who assumed that they were free to cut out all such things from the ancient records of the Saint, soon found that the historical St. Patrick disappeared, leaving nothing in their hands but the scattered members of his acts, which they were then constrained to put together in some new fashion of their own. The Irish nation had reverently carried on the history of her Apostle in an unbroken sequence from the Saint's death, at the end of the fifth century, until the compilation of the Book of Armagh in the middle of the seventh, and thence down to the age of the Four Masters. With the death of the latter in the seventeenth century, night began to gather round the history of the Irish Church. A rival held her sanctuaries and her title-deeds, and turned them to her own purposes, and with little fear of opposition, for both the faith and the learning of ancient days were in penal servitude. As regards learning, the state of things in England was very different. In that country Protestantism had to contend with a Church which, up to the time when the struggle began, had all the advantages of peace and high intellectual cultivation. Moreover, her history was bound up with that of other nations ; but Ireland was alone and forgotten, while centuries of fire and blood separated her from the age of her peace and intellectual glory. In England, therefore, we find that the succession of Orders was the only relic of the past which the Anglican Church ventured to claim, while in Ireland it was boldly asserted that Protestantism was actually the offspring and logical development of the religion of St. Patrick. In both countries the intruders contrived to elude plain matter-of-fact history, and to bury themselves in the obscure regions of archæology, so that the remarks of Cardinal Newman on the characteristics of the Anglican controversy are equally applicable to our subject : "The volume," he observes, "which I am introducing to the reader, elevates the controversy to a higher ground. It refuses to be contented with such petty and evasive manœuvres in behalf of Anglicanism as Catholic disputants have so often put up with, and claims to discuss and judge of it, not by archæology, but by history and common sense."*

* Preface, "The Anglican Ministry," Fr. Hutton, p. viii.

If, however, the helpless and forlorn condition of Ireland gave a sense of security to the assailants of her faith, it was also very unfavourable to that caution and intellectual sobriety so necessary in historical discussions. The specimens we have selected are very far from being the most extravagant and illogical examples of the traditional arguments of this school; but they were good enough for partisans who were either unable or unwilling to verify the statements or analyze the reasonings of their leaders. It has been our object to prove that the historical and archæological fortifications which have been erected around the *new Apostle of Ireland*, or her *many Apostles*, are only formidable at a distance. Ussher, Ledwich, Betham, and Todd—writers of very different intrinsic worth—have one and all set their hands to a work which will ever be a dishonour to the memory of those amongst them who have any literary reputation to lose.

It would, however, be a great mistake to suppose that the Catholic tradition regarding St. Patrick has anything to fear from the investigations of Celtic antiquarians. The labours of the learned translators and editors of the ancient MSS. of Ireland, of the Brehon Laws, or *Cain Patraic*, and we may add of the Transactions of the Ossianic Society, have all contributed to throw a flood of light on the character and mission of the Apostle of Ireland, "The indelible impression," so evident even to the eyes of Dr. Todd, which St. Patrick has left on the "fireside lore," the "local traditions," and the "Churches and Monasteries" of Ireland, is even less astonishing than the stamp which he has impressed on her laws and literature. None of his contemporaries have given us a connected and philosophical account of the way in which his influence operated; but this does not disprove the fact. We may even go further, and argue that the obscurity which surrounded his work is an evidence of its supernatural character. We see the effects of Divine interference, but we cannot sound the secret springs from which they flow.

Until the year of St. Patrick's mission, A.D. 432, the Irish or Scots were Pagans, the fierce destroyers of Christian civilization in Britain and in Gaul as far as the frontiers of Italy.* Then came an interval in which they were almost forgotten, until, in the century following St. Patrick's death, the results of his labours were revealed to the Christian world. His sixty years of spiritual dominion in Ireland had transformed the nation. The country was covered with monasteries, some of

* Dathi, the last Pagan monarch of Ireland, was killed by lightning at the foot of the Alps, A.D. 428. O'Curry, "MS. Materials," p. 125.

which numbered their inmates by thousands, while from their gates Apostles went forth to every country in Europe. Ruins, instinct with life, like the grave of Eliseus, tell of these Irish missionaries from Iona and Lindisfarne to Luxeuil and St. Gall and Bobbio, where, in the year 615, nearly two centuries after the mission of St. Patrick, his great son, St. Columbanus, finished his career in the Italian Fatherland of his faith.

In conclusion, it will not be out of place to refer to the way in which ridicule has fastened on the name of the Apostle of Ireland, and created a sort of prescription against the St. Patrick of former days. This is mainly to be attributed to the fact that, in modern times, he has been pre-eminently the patron and representative of that form of Catholicity which, as it borrows little or nothing from art or literature, and lives only in the hearts of the poor and simple, is regarded as fair game for the sneers of the unbeliever. "Hath any of the rulers believed in him, or of the Pharisees? But this multitude that knoweth not the law are accursed." Time, however, has proved that the faith of the Irish people in their Apostle is as logical as it is enduring; and ridicule, which seemed for a season to triumph over truth, has returned with avenging bitterness on its originators.



ART. IV.—CHURCH AND SCHOOL IN MAURITIUS.

ON the fourteenth of September 1841, an English mail ship to Mauritius sailed into the harbour of Port Louis. Among the groups of passengers who stood on her deck, gazing with the intense interest of new comers to a strange land, was one that would attract the notice of a Catholic—a small band of priests of various nationalities and mostly young, who had come to devote their lives to the spiritual welfare of this distant island, and in their midst the figure of a Bishop, an Englishman in the prime of life, who had come to work with them and to rule and guide their labours. The last named was the Right Rev. Dr. Collier, O.S.B., the newly consecrated Bishop of Milevius *i.p.i.*, and appointed Vicar Apostolic of Mauritius, and one of the most distinguished prelates who have been sent to rule the affairs of this island diocese. One of the priests was, like the bishop, an English Benedictine, others were seculars, and one other, finally, was a Père Laval of the Congregation of the Holy Ghost, a Frenchman, who will figure pro-

minently in the wonderful missionary incident we are going to relate.

We begin the story of the Church in this island from the date of Bishop Collier's arrival, not because the Church was then first introduced into the island, but because the date marks an era in her history. That fourteenth of September was the Feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross, a day, surely of most happy omen for the arrival of a Christian Missionary; and the omen has been marvellously verified in the facts of the bishop's career. Those facts which are to be briefly narrated will show the truth of an assertion made by a well-informed priest, competent from long years of work here to speak as he did: "Bishop Collier's arrival," he writes, "opened an era glorious and fruitful, the benefits of which still live with us. The bishop gathered energetic and zealous priests from France, Belgium, and Ireland, who shared with him the glorious task of transforming the island."

A glance backwards at the earlier spiritual history of the island will show how it came to need transformation. It has been related in a former article* that when the French inhabitants of the colony surrendered to the English in 1810, they stipulated for the preservation of their religion. It goes without the saying that that religion was the Catholic; they were Frenchmen. It unfortunately does not follow that their religion was in the vigour of health, or indeed that it showed itself notably in any Catholic life. A large portion of the French emigrants who had flocked to Mauritius during the eighteenth century left their country during the prevalence of Voltairian doctrine and spirit. They had not lost their faith, but many of them had learned to scoff at it, and to regard its practices with indifference if not with a sentiment worthier of their teacher. Indeed so slow are worldly growths to be quite uprooted, traces of this indifference and want of genuine Catholic feeling may still be found in contrast with the more zealous and praiseworthy spirit that generally prevails. The emigrants had come too, firstly and before all, to make a home and a fortune for themselves in the new-found colony: it is not be marvelled at, therefore, that the care of riches effectually choked the seed of religion and knowledge.

Then came the great Revolution, so destructive of faith and piety in France. It was scarcely less so in this, then French colony. Perhaps the readiness with which these Frenchmen in their far distant homes in the Indian Ocean, with their own special interests and cares, and separated by the immeasurable

* DUBLIN REVIEW, January, 1880, p. 1.

sea from the interests and cares of Frenchmen in France, sympathized with the revolutionary doings in Paris, and imitated them here, will be considered by English readers as somewhat remarkable. But they did respond with enthusiastic fervour to every new phase of revolutionary progress, and did their best to travesty gigantic events on their own narrow stage. When in 1790 a vessel arrived from France bringing intelligence of the great power usurped by the National Assembly, and the officers and crew had landed each adorned with the tricolour cockade, the flames of a sympathetic revolution burst forth and quickly spread. "Liberté, égalité, fraternité," were bandied from mouth to mouth by men who would have abhorred all three things in their true interpretation. We shall see a striking proof of this. A Jacobin Club was established, and named the "Chaumière;" a guillotine was erected in a public square of Port Louis, and to complete the admiring imitation of the mother country, noisy patriots paraded the streets, shouting sedition, defying the laws, and terrifying the officials and governing power on the island. The Mauritians, however, discriminated strangely in their servile imitation. When "égalité" was interpreted at Paris to include God, and worship of Him as a Superior Being was forbidden, then, indeed, the colonists were in admiring accord, and promptly closed churches, abolished the Sunday, banished priests, and tried to forget God: but when, again, later, the same "égalité" was interpreted at Paris to exclude slaveholding, the colonists demurred! The decree of the General Convention abolishing slavery in every French dependency was received with indignation; a proclamation of independence was seriously mooted, and finally the Colonial Assembly passed a resolution forbidding the execution of any law emanating from France unless it had been previously examined and sanctioned.

There were at that time only about 59,000 inhabitants on the island, and of these no less than 49,000 were slaves: a dangerous place one would think, in which to shout liberty and equality, unless the cry were honest. Equality was surely as good a plea for the release of chained slaves, as it was for the murder of the old noblesse and the confiscation of their property. But the mere proposal to release the Mauritian slaves brought the revolution in the island to a standstill; there was deep alarm and apprehension lest the slaves should catch an echo of the dreadful cry, and be inspired by it to free themselves. The recent horrors at St. Domingo were talked of as justifying measures of repression, and slavery went on. It is a grim satire on the meaning of moral cries in the mouths of a mob. After this, demagogues left the street platforms and went home to their slaves;

the Jacobin Club was deserted by degrees, and finally the one guillotine was taken down unstained with blood, and the passions of the crowd grew gradually cool.

Buonaparte having, in 1802, re-established by law the trade in slaves, and thus set the fears of masters here at rest, the news of his election as Consul for life was received by the island "with the greatest transports of joy." The revolution being now a thing of the past, the island again followed the example of France: churches were re-opened, priests returned, and people generally were once more at "liberty" to be good if they chose. But unfortunately the evil spirit that had been evoked, would not be banished so easily, and the worst effects of the movement lived on. Men did not come back to church simply because the doors were opened, and for the first forty years of this century the general air of the Christian community was not one of zealous piety; freemasonry was common among the upper classes of men, and indifference and neglect prevailed. For the most part it was thought religion enough to receive Christian baptism at one end of life and Christian burial at the other—more especially if the interval were made honourable by amassing a fortune from a sugar estate. This, it need hardly be said, was the more general and apparent condition of things. That it was by no means absolutely universal, that there were still not a few zealous Catholics, and that much of the neglect arose from want both of opportunity and of the incitement of higher example rather than from want of generosity and good disposition, will be abundantly proved by the rapidity with which people responded to the call to better things when it came.

Up to the time of the Revolution (from 1712 to 1820), the island had been exclusively served by the French Lazarist Fathers. At least one of them had dared to remain during the excitement of the Revolution, in spite of the decree of banishment, and several returned at once to the different churches when the fury of the storm had abated. These zealous missionaries were the founders of the first parishes and churches on the island; Grand Port, Pamplémousses, Moka, Flacq, and others. They left the island entirely on the arrival of the first English Vicar Apostolic, Mgr. Edward Slater, O.S.B., in 1820. In 1874, however, at the solicitation of the present bishop, Dr. Scarisbrick, some of these Fathers returned to aid in the work here. One of them at his earnest request came more especially to work for the conversion of the poor Chinese spread in such numbers through this colony. Père Glau, who after ten years of labour in China had retired from ill-health, was the first to come in 1874, and had in the year of his stay here

succeeded in instructing and baptizing some thirty Chinamen. But there are numerous and serious difficulties in the way of a large measure of success, chiefly the many and frightful vices of the Chinese themselves, and their contented devotion to the care of earthly things. Another Father of the same Order continues the Chinese mission—but the utmost zeal and energy is discouraged before the immovable indifference of these Orientals. Intermariages of Chinamen with Catholic Creoles are frequent—of course the Chinaman has to be instructed and baptized, and when, as sometimes happens, he becomes a Catholic really, he is a very good one, but for the most part he never practises the religion he has been taught. He will, however, take pride in being able to send his wife to Mass richly dressed, and is far from offended when passers-by remark how grand Madame Chinois looks. As a rule these marriages are happy ones for the wives. It is remarkable that whatever may be his own vices, the Chinaman looks for a virtuous wife; hence he is shrewd enough never to marry an Indian woman. But this is digressing from our main purpose.

One event had immediately preceded the coming of Dr. Collier, which it would have been natural to suppose, had only rendered the moral condition of the colony a degree worse than before. In 1839, as has been related* the negro slave population had been emancipated. Almost suddenly and without any previous discipline, more than 65,000 slaves, of a nation proverbially void of foresight and self-control, were abandoned to the difficult task of self-government and self-support. How they fared in the latter respect is not now our concern; we shall presently be interested in learning how they were aided in the former by the Catholic missionaries.

We have said that a small band of priests accompanied Dr. Collier in 1841; he found a few others already at work in his new diocese. But he soon saw that if the state of religion was to be changed, he had need of a much more numerous body of zealous and self-sacrificing labourers, and he at once courageously faced the long voyage back again to Europe, to gather, if he could, recruits for the arduous work. His quick glance had also taken in another need of his charge—that of a good Catholic education for the young. He sent from Europe in 1844 three more priests, one of whom was the Abbé Mazuy, who, like Père Laval already mentioned, became a leader of

* DUBLIN REVIEW, January, 1880, p. 12. The explanation was then omitted that after the unattached apprentices had been freed on Feb. 1, the period still remaining for those attached to the soil was made to cease by a Proclamation of March 11, and slavery then entirely ceased.

the religious movement, and in the following year he returned again to Mauritius with some five more priests, and a volunteer corps of brave nuns—five teaching and three lay sisters from the Loretto Convent of Rathfarnham, near Dublin. These Loretto sisters were the first nuns in Mauritius. Bishop, clergy and nuns now devoted themselves, heart and soul, to the task before them. Père Laval, who came here with the bishop in 1841, was a remarkable man both for his natural gifts and his virtues. He had been first a physician and then had studied for the priesthood, and both as a student in medicine and a student in the Church, as a doctor and as a curé, was known for a virtuous man, faithful to God and to duty, charitable and compassionate towards every infirmity, and of that engaging disposition and self-devotedness which attracts and wins all hearts. He joined the congregation which the venerated Père Libermann had lately founded for the conversion of the blacks. His confessor had told him that he was called to work for the most abandoned and necessitous souls, and when he came to Mauritius he found his work awaiting him. He commenced at once, at the Cathedral where he was stationed, catechetical instructions for the blacks; he became their apostle. It was arduous and slow work, and his patience was scarcely less brilliantly manifested than was his zeal. At the end of six months he presented his first three neophytes to the bishop to be baptized by him; he wished the first-fruits of his labours to be received by the chief pastor of the flock. At the end of three years he wrote to his superior, Père Libermann, that three hundred converts had made their first communion; before five years were over, the Cathedral was filled at his instructions, and he himself was fast being spent with the fatigue. From time to time one or other of his religious brethren came to his aid. In the year 1847 he was assisted by two of these, and from that period his mission grew to an extent simply marvellous; first communicants were now counted by thousands. The special benediction of the Providence who had called the apostle was shed over his work; a religious movement had set in which soon took such proportions that the whole island bent before it. A French chronicler of the period says: "*Le mouvement religieux était si grand, l'impulsion de la grâce si générale dans toute la population qu'il y avait évidemment des prodiges. On sentait qu'une grande miséricorde s'exerçait sur ce petit pays, et qu'il y avait un Saint qui avait su toucher le cœur de Dieu.*"

Before ten years had passed from the baptism of those first three converts, not only had the whole mass of those who had so recently received the precious gift of their liberty,

received the still more precious freedom of the sons of God; but the zealous people soon became by their fervour, simple piety, and self-sacrificing devotion, in their turn apostles of prayer and of example to their late masters. How many thousands of them were baptized in the twenty years of Bishop Collier's administration, which we are now more particularly describing, cannot be exactly told. No careful calculation was made, but it is not an exaggeration to say that they were all converted. Not two per cent. of them became anything else. There was at the period (there is not now) a Wesleyan Chapel which was attended by about a score of them on Sundays.

The Abbé Mazuy had meanwhile by his abilities and virtues become the apostle of the white population, who as we have just said were in no small measure affected and influenced by the zeal and example of the converted *affranchis*. But they were themselves also ready hearers and willing doers when a zealous and devoted priesthood both preached and worked among them. Indeed those days witnessed the religious fervour of primitive times. Once won to the faith or to the practice of true Catholic life, differences of nationality and of colour gave way naturally to form one large but united Catholic family with a community of zeal, and of prayers, and of charity. The few churches that had so long stood half-deserted, not only filled to overflowing, but were soon found to be too distant to meet the requirements of the complete change. New parishes were formed, and churches and chapels, and schools and convents, rose in quick succession in every part of the island. The united body of the clergy too, with even the enthusiasm and devotedness of apostles, were soon insufficient for the spiritual needs of their flocks. Crowded Confessionals and Altar-rails, frequent and devout attendance at Mass, zeal in unobtrusive good-doing, testified to the reality of the spiritual change in the hearts of the people. The rich gave generously of their wealth—the Mauritians are always ready and generous when religion has to be aided. They have fully sustained in this the tradition of their French ancestry. The newly-freed people who had little or nothing yet to give, rivalled the widow's mite by giving themselves. They might often be seen, men and women, in the forests cutting down timber for building chapels, and women young and old, dragging along the roads cart-loads of stones or building materials, and singing their newly-learned hymns as they slowly moved along. In the days of slavery, they said, we were forced to do it and harder work, for our masters, why should we not do as much now freely, for our Redeemer and Lord? This is quite typical of the thorough and enthusiastic way in which they fulfilled all their Christian duties. After their conversion

they were an extremely religious people, of intense simple faith, and, as will not surprise the reader, with a particular fondness for religious ceremonies. They thought nothing of walking, in those days of fewer churches, ten, even twenty miles to be present at Mass or at a function. Such scenes as the following, told by a witness of it, were frequent at that time: "I remember," he says, "one night, the eve of Palm Sunday, about twelve o'clock, before I had gone to bed, I heard the voices and prayers of a crowd of them who had already congregated round the Cathedral. They were going to pass the night there in order to be ready for the opening of the church doors at four o'clock on the Sunday morning. There were mothers there with infants in their arms; I heard them crying." Among other incidents characteristic of this simple-minded people, another missionary tells of an old man who before going to bed on Saturday nights would go out to the cock roosting on the tree at his hut door, and with true African quaintness bid the bird not to forget to crow very early next morning, as he must not miss the five o'clock Mass and Holy Communion. And they were equally constant in less attractive duties; for example, they fasted strictly, indeed many of them ate nothing on fast days before sunset. In their anxiety to be instructed, young children from school often spent the evening at home teaching the catechism to father and mother who were busy at work during the day. There is one other incident out of the multitude that are told of this period of change and fervour, that we should like to tell. A Catholic woman lived at a place called Black River at a point some twenty miles from Port Louis. At that time there was no church nearer than the Cathedral in the city, though no less than three churches intervene at the present day. Regularly, once a month, this poor woman walked on a Saturday to Port Louis, went to Confession, to Communion and Mass on the Sunday, and on the Monday morning walked all the way home again. Nor was this all: not far from her home was a river the bridge over which had been swept away by one of the frequent floods. Her husband used to accompany her as far as the river and help her to wade through it—the water being up to her knees—she then walked the remaining eighteen miles in her wet clothes. On her return on Monday morning she always found her husband waiting on her side of the river ready to help her through it again! The husband was an English soldier stationed there, and was not a Catholic, and his zealous and courageous wife, it is pleasant to add, was an Irishwoman.

In the September of 1864, spent with his unremitting labours, the saintly Père Laval died, and was buried at La Sainte Croix, in the Vallée des Prêtres, where a tomb erected by a grateful

and sorrowing people will long keep alive the remembrance of his noble deeds. His memory is held in benediction; everywhere in the island his picture has a place of honour in the houses or the poor whom he so devotedly loved, and it is even the popular opinion that miracles have been wrought at his tomb. The Abbe Mazuy is still living, and as long as strength did not absolutely fail him, he would never treat himself to the repose which all but himself believed he had well deserved. For ten years past he has been stricken with blindness, but he will not leave Mauritius, and awaits his reward in patience, amidst the scenes of his long labours.

It was impossible not to make prominent mention of these two truly apostolic men, but it is not possible here even to name the long list of priests who gave, together with them, their lives and energies to the grand religious movement. Each man according to his gifts and opportunities was zealous and self-sacrificing to a degree which has made the clergy of that time a model to their successors and an abiding joy to the Church in Mauritius. Nay, the mass of the people were devoted, earnest and good, to an extent that, as has been said, recalled the fervour of Apostolic times. Pères Laval and Mazuy were heroes in a company where all were brave. We may not speak as we would wish of the venerated bishop who gave the impulse and direction to all this marvellous revolution of grace; happily his Lordship is still alive; we shall do best, therefore, to leave aside mere words of eulogy, however highly deserved. But we shall, in justice to our subject, give a statement of facts that will carry their own comment. This much may be permitted us to observe in reference to the great change in the Church here which has always been linked, both by Catholics and Protestants, with Bishop Collier's name, that if the bishop had a noble band of zealous and self-sacrificing priests, these in turn had in him a courageous, able, and sagacious leader. He planned, directed, and still more, gave impetus and character to the movement by the force of his own energy and example. But above them all, both prelate and priest and people, was the grace of Him who blessed them and prospered them in a work of which He Himself is the only reward they have ever sought: *Non nobis, sed nomine Tuo da gloriam.*

We shall, as briefly as possible, sketch the contrast between Mauritius of 1841 and Mauritius of 1863, the year of Bishop Collier's departure. At the former date he found seven priests, at the latter he left no fewer than twenty-eight. During the same twenty years, some twelve churches of stone were erected, and more than twelve chapels of wood in outlying districts, where from the insufficiency of priests Mass could be said only

occasionally. In the year 1846 the number of Easter Communion was computed at 3,473, and in 1861 at 16,904, we may add that last year (1879) the Easter Communion numbered over 20,000. In a "Report" on morality and religion in the island made by the Bishop to Governor Stevenson in January, 1862, he says: "On my arrival here I found an immense number of persons called Christians living in concubinage without remorse; and although this is still too common, it has become, at least by comparison, rare, and there is now affixed to it a degree of dishonour which was formerly unknown." Thus, during the years 1847 and 1848, when the movement of reform was at its height, the number of Catholic marriages had far more than doubled the average of ten years before. People who had not troubled to have themselves married, scarcely troubled to have their children baptized: but the bishop could report a steady yearly increase in the number of baptisms in figures which showed that the neglect of baptism was fast becoming a rarity. The figures are 1616 baptisms for 1858, 1668 for 1859, 1725 for 1860, and 1790 for 1861. The following Table of Baptisms, which also appears in the same Report, testifies to a marked effect of the spiritual influences which had been brought to bear on this colony.

YEAR.	CHILDREN.		TOTAL.	DIFFERENCE.
	LEGITIMATE.	ILLEGITIMATE.		
1847	515	1293	1808	778 Illegitimate
1848	627	1277	1904	650 "
1860	924	801	1725	123 Legitimate
1861	995	795	1790	200 "

It may be remarked that the larger number of baptisms in the two years 1847 and 1848 is due to the fact just before stated; the rush to repair former neglect, when the moral change had set in. It is pleasant to add that up to the present time the number of illegitimate births goes on sensibly diminishing. So far as Catholics are concerned they may soon be reduced to a minimum if only Government will, as there are indications that it will, now aid the clergy in the work of moralization.*

* In the quarter ending 30th Sept. 1879, 3,319 births were registered in Mauritius. Of these 1,124 were legitimate, the remaining 2,195 illegitimate. But it must be remarked, that 2,199 of the total births were among the Indian population, notoriously immoral. There are no

One chief source of aid must come from a more practical marriage code. English readers may be startled at the large figures which represent illegitimate births; two-thirds of the population of the island it must not be forgotten are Indians, with no religious restraints; the lower class population are victims of many temptations, from the mixture of races, religions, and paganisms. The enervating influences of the climate, juvenile precocity, are also influencing conditions. One source of regret to the venerated prelate in the Report is the amount of work done on Sundays. "I regret to say," he continues, "that very little regard is paid in our sugar manufactories to the Christian observance of Sunday. The *corvée* ought to end at eight A.M., it is continued to eleven A.M., and even longer. An Order of Council of July 5, 1841, defines distinctly the kind and duration of Sunday's work. Out of three hundred sugar estates only about thirty observe the law." This bad fruit of the French Revolution has never been got rid of; the clergy have still to complain of the *corvée*; it is, in fact, a practical prohibition to multitudes of Catholic workmen to assist at Mass.

The statistics we have quoted speak for themselves; the labours and prayers of the missionaries had been crowned with success; they had revived a dormant faith and led a whole population to the practice of religion. It would not be possible here to relate in detail all the laborious efforts by which these happy results were arrived at. The erection of schools and convents, the education of the young, and thought and care of the various wants and demands of this most heterogeneous diocese, the care of the sick, and a multitude of other needs had all to be supplied by the direction and often by the personal action of the chief pastor. We have seen that he brought over with him a band of Loretto nuns from Ireland: the generous charity of a few individuals soon provided them with a home and the magnificent grounds in which it is placed. The site is extensive, and the large gardens are supplied with abundant trees of various descriptions that afford grateful and healthful shade for the recreation of the pupils. Here in November, 1845, the first convent of Our Lady of Loretto was opened. As in their mother house at Rathfarnham, so here the sisters offered to girls of the upper classes the best possible education, together with the inestimable advantage of a safe and religious home. The success of the Loretto sisters has been complete. A second home became a necessity, and was founded in 1870 at

statistics to show what proportion of births among the non-Indian or resident population were of this character.—*Registrar General of Mauritius's Report*, Oct. 1879.)

Curepipe. Curepipe is on the higher inland plateau, and has the healthiest and most temperate climate of the island. The sisters' grounds here are also spacious and beautiful. In both these convent-schools the subjects taught embrace the highest subjects for girls usual in European schools, and the teaching is of the best; but those more practical acquirements such as sewing and the like, so necessary to fit even the better class of girls for their future as wives and mothers, receive their share of care and time. More than fourteen hundred pupils, belonging to the best families in the colony, have already been brought up at Loretto, and have taken thence not only learning and accomplishments, but virtuous principles and habits that have formed the greater charm in their influence, and brought grace and happiness to their homes. But the sisters have also extensive free schools, which have been a great success. Large numbers of girls have easily obtained good situations from them; reading, writing, sewing, and other very practical and useful acquirements, joined to thorough religious training, have gained the schools a good reputation. But Bishop Collier also founded an order of nuns, of native ladies, to be devoted to the service of the sick, of the abandoned poor, of orphans, of all who should need their care—the Sisters of Notre Dame de Bon Secours. They spread rapidly, and now count some twenty establishments and nearly a hundred and fifty sisters. They have the care of hospitals, public and private; of Government asylums, of their own orphanages, of their numerous free schools, all taught and supported by the sisters—a few of them being assisted by Government; and finally of their hospital in the city for the care of those afflicted with that most frightful of human diseases, the leprosy. How well the zealous reverend mother and foundress, Mère Augustine, and her sisters have merited of Mauritius—not Catholic Mauritius only, but of all classes and nations—might easily be told here in detail, if we had time to do so. Self-devoted teachers to the numerous children in their schools, mothers to the orphans in their charge, it need not be said they are. Their heroic, self-sacrificing conduct during the cholera of 1854, and other epidemics that have stricken the island, has been recognized by Government itself, which has placed the sisters in some of its own hospitals, and lunatic asylums. During the dreadful epidemic of 1867, the chapel of the mother-house of the order was converted into an ambulance, and more than five hundred victims of the fever were nursed there. Their hospital for lepers lately contained more than one hundred and fifty of those unfortunates. The munificent assistance rendered to these sisters by most of the best families on the island, by an in-

numerable crowd of benefactors of every rank, in founding their houses, schools and hospitals, and contributing to their support, is both a supreme testimony to the esteem in which the people hold them, and is no less a noble proof of the charity of the Mauritians. That charity has been nowhere more conspicuously generous than with regard to the *Sœurs de Charité*, as these native nuns are deservedly called. To name their benefactors would be to name the whole Catholic colony. And the same may be said of the other orders of nuns, and indeed of every good work from the building of a church or a school to the demands of a parochial charity. The Institute de Bon Secours has completed thirty years of its existence, and already nearly that number of sisters have gone to their reward, the victims, in many instances, of their devotion to the fever-stricken.

We cannot even find room to mention Bishop Collier's many other efforts for the spiritual and general good of his diocese and the success that attended them. Among other efforts for education he introduced the *Frères Chrétiennes* to teach secondary boys' schools. He found one quarter of the city inhabited by Indians whose fathers had come from the Malabar coast and who of course were Christians, at least by tradition. He applied himself to the spiritual welfare of these disciples of St. Francis Xavier, and obtained the services of some Fathers of the Society of Jesus, and a site, and eventually a church. Some of the Fathers are still entirely devoted to the needs of these people, who have their own chapels, mass and instructions. When the bishop came to this diocese, St. Helena belonged to it: he obtained of Rome, that it should be annexed to the Cape Vicariate. The Seychelles Islands were also under his charge; and in the same way, he induced the Holy See to erect these into a separate Vicariate. In another dependence of Mauritius, the island of Rodrigues, the inhabitants were Catholics by tradition; but had never had a resident priest among them. There is one now, and there are two chapels. Rodrigues is some 330 miles distant from Mauritius. Bishop Collier himself went there; the first bishop that had ever set foot on the island, and when the people had been for some months prepared for the holy sacraments, he administered confirmation to about two-thirds of the whole population. We have said that the bishop left Mauritius in 1862; he felt that his strength was unequal to the further discharge of his onerous duties and he resigned his charge. After what we have read, we are not surprised that Sir W. Stephenson, the Governor at the time of Dr. Collier's departure should have complimented him on "the progress of morality in Mauritius during his episcopacy,"

and still less surprised that the Holy See should have given him the flattering assurance that he had merited its fullest confidence—*plenissimam fiduciam*.*

Having sketched this history of the religious revival in Mauritius, we proceed to give the reader some idea of the actual state of the Church here at the present moment. One result, though we trust not the only one, will be to show that the revival of religion in one people and conversion of another which we have related, was not an evanescent spiritual movement, but a true work of grace which both lives on and shows every token of strength and endurance. The religion of the various nationalities which constitute the population of the island, so far as they are Christian, is the Catholic—the exception being the minority which represents the nation that governs. The exception is named in no spirit of discontent. The people of Mauritius have long enjoyed the great advantage, political and commercial, of their subjection to English rule and have prospered therewith: they have also enjoyed on matters religious an amount of help, encouragement, and fair dealing, that even if it be within the letter of a solemn promise, is nevertheless deserving of both recognition and gratitude.† On one subject unfortunately, that of education, the interests and views of Government and of the Church here, have long been and are still in conflict—but this is no more than happens at the moment in almost every Christian nation. And so long as statesmen cannot be brought to recognize the *immediate* and *direct* connection between the school and the church, in Mauritius at least they cannot be charged on the count of a breach of their engagement. The English Government supports the Catholic religion to an extent which it judges a fair one, in the same proportion as it supports the churches and ministers of the English Church; and it may be said that tolerance and a friendly tone has always characterized the legislative acts and the spirit of the executive. Every individual official sent out from England has not risen to the high level of his own government, and treated the Church with the courtesy it deserved, or acted as liberally towards our Christianity as towards the fetichism of Hindus; but these were exceptions. The Catholic Church has been respected by England, and is free in the colony. It need not be added that the Church is loyal to the State, nor that the great object of the efforts of bishop

* Quoted from Article on Bp. Collier in "Men of the Time."

† "That the inhabitants shall retain their religion, their laws and their customs" is the 8th Article of the Act of Capitulation, against which the English wrote "granted."

and clergy is the one for which Government also works—the well-being of the people and the amelioration and moral improvement of the masses.

The Anglican and Independent Churches in Mauritius do not number many more than 6000 souls all told. The appointment therefore of an Anglican bishop it will be seen was a tribute rather to supremacy than the supply of any need. The Church of England and the Catholic bishops and clergy enjoy respectively the same legal recognition; and the State pays them equal salaries. The two bishops are sufficiently distinguished by their titles, the Anglican dignitary being known as the Bishop of Mauritius and our own as the Bishop of Port Louis. The State allows a salary of £200, and £150, per annum, to a number of Catholic priests, fixed according to the supposed needs of the Catholic people. Naturally Government is slow to add to this number—its increase therefore is a very safe test of advance at least as far it goes. When Bishop Collier left the island, there were 28 priests, of whom 23 were salaried, the first twelve on the list at £200 per annum, and the remaining eleven at £150.* There are at this moment 42 State-paid priests. It may be added that the total number of priests on the island is now 57: and that they are far from being a sufficient number for the amount of work before them. The difficulty of the zealous chief pastor of the Church here is, indeed, precisely this: to find volunteers for this difficult and dangerous mission—dangerous, that is, to health. But if the work be both dangerous and arduous; if the grim enemy, fever, lurks in every hut and wayside, and after once taking hold of its victim rarely entirely leaves him; if, here, “the heat of the day,” be literally the “burden” of it—yet is the work among an affectionate and a willing people; a people of great faith and devotion. We think the wants of this important diocese only need to be better known in England and France to draw a sufficient number of fervent young Levites as volunteer recruits; each nation has a particular interest in the welfare of the Mauritian Church. Some readers may wonder why it does not supply its own priests. There have always been a few native priests; and they have generally been conspicuous for ability and virtue. Only a short time ago there were four. Last year the death of one of them—the

* From the great difference in prices, &c., here, this sum represents only half the *value*—i.e., it is equivalent to salaries of £100, and £75 in England. When a priest has served ten years he may be pensioned if over sixty years of age, or broken in health, according to the scale of pensions for all Government servants, the amount corresponding to length of service, nature of duty performed, &c.

Abbé Faduilhe—took place; it was an occasion of general mourning in Port Louis, and of sincere grief among the youths of the poorer classes to whom he had been specially and very successfully devoted. Another, a young man of only twenty-six years, died the year previously; another has retired from ill-health, and one alone remains, but in shattered health. Experience forces the conviction that the Creole constitution is not strong enough for the fatigues of a missionary life in the tropics. There are, however, at this moment, two more native students waiting to go to Europe for their ecclesiastical studies and training for this mission.

The Colonial Government also aids the building of Churches. £1000 is annually voted for Church building-grants, and is distributable amongst the three recognized Churches: the Catholic, Anglican, and Independent. Formerly, £400 of this was the Catholic share. But Bishop Scarisbrick has obtained that it should be raised to £700, a proportion more in keeping with the absolute preponderance of Catholics. Help from this grant is however only made to the maximum amount of £1,000 to a Church, and then provided a sum equal to that granted be raised by voluntary subscriptions. Special help is also afforded by Government in the same manner for the support of Indian Missions, except that the Catholics share of this is only £500.

There is now scarcely a parish in the island which has not a convent, and, with the convent, either a school or some one of the many forms of charitable work. But besides the benefit arising directly from the special work of each house of sisters, they have from the first, silently, but notably, effected a great good among their own sex. Serving as a pattern and an example of woman's most religious and heroic career, they have had an immeasurable influence in elevating a population, that at their coming, had to a large extent, practically lost sight of the Christian idea of woman. What a work had to be done in this respect in elevating the *classe affranchie*, may be judged from the fact that, under French rule, slaves could contract no legal marriages. Their unions were natural merely, and could be broken at the caprice of a master, or at the whim of either party. Of course, they had no legal status, being merely, whatever their sex, the white man's chattels. The people, as has been already said, highly esteem, and generously support their nuns. Besides the two orders mentioned, two other orders of women have now houses in Mauritius: the "*Filles de Marie*," founded at Reunion, and established here, since 1864; and "*Les Réparatrices*," brought here in 1866, by Bishop Hankinson, for the care of an Indian orphanage. Concerning the former, very

much the same noble history might, had we space, be told, as has already been sketched, of the "Sœurs de bon Secour." But the "Filles de Marie" are specially devoted to the service of the blacks, and during the famous epidemic, many of them died, the victims of their unselfish devotion. The "Réparatrices" as they are called, are more particularly dedicated to work for the Indian populations, and render valuable aid in this way to the Fathers of the Society of Jesus. They are specially devoted to the Blessed Sacrament, which is exposed for adoration every day in their chapel in the Rue Cotton: they have, besides the Indian orphanage and schools, frequent classes of religious instruction; and in their convent ladies make an annual retreat, and girls are prepared for their first communion. The order of Bon Secours was founded for Creole ladies; but these are to be found in every convent. Indeed, the convents, like the colony itself, are communities of every race and colour: European, African, and Indian. It is a source of edification to the English stranger to see the bronze and ebony faces, framed in the familiar white veil of the nun, and recalls the Catholicity of the Church.

Among the many good works, of a more general nature, such as the Society of St. Vincent de Paul for visiting the sick and needy, &c., we must find a word for one very excellent recent institution. A "Union Catholique," after the model of the English Catholic Union, has been now three years in existence, and is destined we hope in the future, to far excel even the excellent good it has already done. We shall find it taking a notable step in the struggle for Catholic education; but the most praiseworthy result anticipated from it, and already in a measure effected, is the creation of a Catholic public opinion, the spread of sympathy and concern among men of the upper classes for Catholic interests, and of a more genuine and zealous—in a word, of a more Catholic tone and spirit generally. The Catholic Union of Mauritius has no easy task before it. Thus, it lately sought recognition and legal status from the Legislative Council, that would enable it to possess property, &c., a boon which societies of other religions, and of no religion, have already obtained. Two forces were opposed to its demand—bigotry and indifference. A large number of members absented themselves, and left a hostile minority, free to carry the adjournment—equivalent to the rejection of the Bill. The independent press at once saw and exposed the injustice and illiberalism of this treatment.* The reasons given

* "La terreur causée par l'Union Catholique est telle que l'on oublie la loi suprême qui nous régit: la liberté égale pour tous."—*Cernéen*

in the speeches of the opposing members, were as foolish as flimsy, and quite unworthy of "liberal" statesmen. Dread of the domination of the Church, of the propagandism of Catholic societies, of the growth of priestcraft, are among the puerile reasons given for thwarting a just and temperate demand of the Catholic majority. The Catholic Union, however, is determined not to relinquish the attempt to gain civil personality, because of this rebuff. It will try again; let us trust, for the honour of the Council, with better success. Meanwhile every zealous Catholic wishes it well in all its undertakings.

In spite of this opposition of bigotry and false sentiment, the statistics and details already given will show that the Catholic Church in this island is pursuing steadily a career of success, and accomplishing, under God, the great object of her existence and her desires—the salvation of the souls committed to her care. To convert, if possible, and make a Christian of every man and woman who comes within her influence, whether neighbour or stranger, English or French, Creole, or Chinese, or Indian; this she does, and must do—it is her mission. To gain influence merely, or position, or the domination of priestcraft (whatever that may be), or political power, or any one of the countless other unworthy aims so flippantly laid to her charge, is alien to her spirit, as it is far indeed from the desires of both bishop and clergy.

We now pass to the second half of our subject, the question of education. Unfortunately we have left for it a limited space quite out of proportion to its importance. The character of the struggle, however, here carried on between Church and State is a reproduction with local variations of the great European struggle. The battle may be small, but it is not unimportant; the same passions are at war against the same sacred principles, and the results of defeat to the Church would be ruinous to countless souls.

It is not our purpose to speak of higher education; we will only remark that it is better provided for than would be anticipated in an island of only 100,000 Christian inhabitants. There is a Royal College—Governmental and non-religious of course—which prepares for the professions and for English and French universities. There is also a higher Catholic College,

newspaper, 28th Nov., 1879. "Certains Conseillers se sont figurés que l'Union Catholique visait à l'autorité universelle, qu'elle voulait mettre la main sur le pays, et étendre, nouvelle pieuvre, ses tentacules innombrables sur la colonie tout entière. Tout cela est fort bien raisonné, fort bien pensé pour ceux qui ont reçu du ciel une vive imagination dont les personnes pratiques n'ont pas le bonheur d'être douées."—*Mercantile Record and Commercial Gazette*, 27th November.

the "Collège Diocésain" in Port Louis, conducted by Fathers of the Congregation of the Holy Ghost—the order of which Père Laval was the first member in the island. It was founded in 1868, and from very humble beginnings has flourished and grown both in efficiency and numbers to an extent that speaks absolutely for its high position in the esteem of the people. One of its most successful Superiors was Père Duboin, greatly esteemed for his virtue and abilities, who is now Vicar Apostolic of Senegambia. The Fathers, in 1873, commenced new buildings which have added greatly to both the appearance, healthiness, and efficiency of the College. Numerous pupils of the College have been successful at the university examinations of both England and France. The studies are based on the programme of the University of France, but there is special provision, and a large staff of professors, for the study of English language and literature.

There are for young ladies the Loretto convents already mentioned. There are also private schools of all kinds, and these are both numerous and of an excellent description. Thus there is no dearth of education for those who can pay for it. Our concern is with what is being done for primary education for the poorer classes. In spite of a large expenditure of public money, popular education is less advanced in Mauritius than in perhaps any other British colony.* A large number of children are allowed to grow up without the moralizing influence of any education; whilst those who go to Government schools are educated under a system which is opposed to Catholic principles, and fails to supply the great Catholic need.

There are two distinct classes of elementary schools; the Government or Official schools, and those which are known as the Grant-in-Aid schools. The former are State property, supported by State money, and directed by a State official, the superintendent of schools. They are attended by children of all religions and of no religion, and the teaching is called in the Reports, undenominational—called by Catholics, with much reason, godless. The teachers in them are well-trained and salaried. Scholars attending them enjoy advantages, in competition for scholarships in the Royal College, denied to any other

* 363 marriages were registered in the third quarter of 1879. "In 102 instances only were the registers signed by both parties, in 115 instances by only one, and in 146 cases neither of the contracting parties could sign."—*Registrar General's Report*, page 3. But it must be confessed that the vast immigrant and floating population greatly reduces the significance of the fact, and presents a very serious obstacle to anything like universal education.

schools.* In these schools every pupil is taught reading, writing, and grammar of the English and French languages simultaneously. French because it is the language of the colony, English because it is the language of the Government and the executive. In the Grant-in-aid schools, on the contrary, one language is alone required in the examinations. This is an advantage, as the progress of their children in general subjects is less retarded by difficulties of language. In Catholic schools, of course, French is the language; but English is taught in nearly all of them, because boys aim at obtaining clerkships and other such inferior posts as are open to them in Government offices,† where English is a necessity. English is, however, far more taught in both classes of schools than is of any benefit to the children.

Grant-in-aid schools are the possession of private individuals recognized by Government as managers, and are helped by grants of money from the State according to certain results of attendance and examinations. These schools are denominational—that is to say, religious teaching can be given in them, provided secular instruction occupies four hours daily for 200 school-days per annum, very much as is the case with aided schools in England. Whilst Catholics object to the official schools, they would gladly be content with the grant-in-aid system, if only it were treated liberally or even fairly; then it could be worked for the benefit of Catholic children, very much by the same methods as have been so ably set forth in a recent article in this REVIEW.‡ The complaint is that they are treated neither

* In 1878, four Royal College bourses, and two needlework bourses for girls were competed for. The successful candidates for the former became entitled to three years' free tuition at the Royal College, together with an allowance of cash, 100 rupees (£10) per annum, for personal expenses.—*Report on Primary Instruction in Mauritius for School-year 1877-78*,§ by the Superintendent and Inspector of Schools, p. 21. Also in 1878 two ex-pupils of Government schools gained English scholarships entitling each of them to £200 per annum free of income tax for four years, £75 for their passage to England, and the same sum their return.—*Report*, p. 23.

† All the higher and responsible offices in the State departments are held by Englishmen. Mr. Pike says: "English is taught in all the schools, but judging from the small amount of it spoken, with no great results; English being the exceptional, not the ruling language" (p. 454). Of course we cannot share the opinion of Mr. Pike and a host of others here, that the prevalence of English would be a boon to the colony. We shall see that the English have created by their action in schools the sentiment that religion is a thing of nationality: the Creole at present thinks of English in connection with law and Protestantism, and the less he has to do with either the better.

‡ "Our Elementary Schools and their Work," DUBLIN REVIEW, Oct., 1879.

liberally nor fairly. In a Minute dated Dec. 10th, 1878, Sir Arthur Phayre, then Governor of this island, stated that for the past twelve years aided schools "have not been treated with justice" by the Government. Injustice still continues; thus the sum of 40,000 rupees (£4,000) only is allowed yearly for grants to aided schools. This sum is remarkable for its utter inadequacy to the purpose. Grant schools can neither increase nor multiply, except by unaided private effort, because the sum voted is already absorbed by existent aided schools. There are at the moment some fifteen schools (seven of them being managed by clergymen of the Church of England) applying for the assistance they cannot get. Numerous other schools would apply, but know the uselessness of doing so. Priests strive to open a school, and supply it with material and with efficient teachers—the expense soon exceeds available means—no aid can be got from Government, and the attempt has often to be abandoned; for an inferior school only does harm by contrasting with the well-supplied and long-established official school, and by furnishing the Inspector with another opportunity of crying aloud against the inefficiency, of which his own Government are really guilty by withholding help. Thus Government schools, so objectionable to Catholics, continue to monopolize the locality, and leave parents no choice.

Official schools are aided by an unlimited supply of funds, and the one verdict on them of both friend and foe is that they are enormously expensive. "There are fifty Government elementary schools. The cost of them in actual annual payments is 191,212 rupees (£19,121). This does not include superintendence, inspection, or expenses for repairs to buildings owned by Government," said the Governor in 1878.* In the same document, His Excellency showed that the net cost to Government of each pupil was :

	In 1875.			In 1876.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
In Government Schools .	3	9	2	3	12	11
In Aided Schools . . .	1	6	8	1	3	8

* "Annexure to Minute No. 94 of his Excellency the Governor," 1878, page 6. From Inspector's Report, 1878, 54 Government schools were examined, containing an average of 5337 pupils on the rolls, and 56 Grant-in-Aid schools with an average attendance of 4161 pupils. Of these 56 denominational schools, 38 are Catholic, 16 Church of England, and 2 are classed under "Independent Mission."

The same results still continue. The official system costs Government therefore vast sums of money and has the evil effect of superseding private effort. The aided system is a lighter burden to the State, excites private effort, gives religious satisfaction to parents, and, *cæteris paribus*—is equally efficient.

Mr. Charles Bruce, Rector of the Royal College, writing in 1878, of the official schools says :

It appears probable that out of 2129 children who passed the Standards, at least 1700 passed in the Standards I. to III. In these Standards the work is purely mechanical, and the quality required, strictly moderate, and yet the large sums spent in some of the Government schools, did not, in the great majority of cases, produce results beyond these feeble demands. At Petite Rivière, where each scholar who passed cost the Government no less than 270 rupees, none passed beyond Standard III. ; at Tamarind Bay, where each scholar that passed cost 144 rupees, none passed beyond Standard II. . . . In this system, the principle of result payments works inversely—the less you get the more you pay for it.”*

His Lordship, the present Bishop, who has ever since his coming here in 1872 struggled hard to obtain from the State help and security for Catholic education—and we may add has had the misfortune of struggling thus far without definite success—has founded a “Diocesan Committee of Education” composed of six priests and six laymen ; the six priests elected by himself, the six laymen elected by the Council of the Catholic Union. The object of the Committee is to spread a right sentiment in Catholic minds on this education question, to gain strength by union among the Catholic body, and to secure unanimity in their action in the struggle. In a Paper drawn up by this Committee and forwarded by the Bishop to the Governor and by him placed before the Legislative Council, it is demonstrated : That the number of scholars in Government schools does not increase, whilst the increase is rapid in aided schools—showing the preference of the people : that the success of pupils in the latter compares favourably with that of pupils in official schools : that Catholics who contribute nine-tenths of the Christian scholars and three-fourths of the total number † are con-

* “Annexure A to Minutes of Council of Education, 3rd April, 1878.” fol. 1631.

† The Superintendent’s Report of 1878 shows the religion of scholars thus :

	CATHOLIC.	CHURCH OF ENGLAND.	INDEPENDENT MISSION.	MAHOMEDAN.	HINDOO AND OTHERS.
Government Schools	5406	340	186	427	1160
Aided Schools . .	4108	394	91	164	757

tented with the aided and cannot accept the official schools : that the results obtained by aided schools are the more remarkable that they are in spite of the numerous and great advantages enjoyed by Government schools ; that the Superintendent of Schools though prejudiced against aided schools is obliged to admit both their efficiency and their popularity ; and that the aided schools educate three times the proportion of girls more than do the official schools. This is an important point. The proportion of girls in the last-named schools is thirty-one per cent. ; in aided schools is eighty-seven per cent. Parents prefer religion and the safeguards of one class of schools for their girls. The Sisters of Charity chiefly inspire this marked confidence not only among Catholic but often among Indian mothers. The unreasonable conditions required for teachers' certificates of the higher order, prevent aided schools securing good masters, and deprive them of the services of the Christian Brothers, who would soon by their influence attract a large attendance of boys. One more remark before we pass to the Catholic demands. Of the scholars who at present attend Government schools seventy-five per cent. are Catholics, Anglicans being only five per cent. ; Independents two ; Mahomedans four ; and "Hindoos and others" fourteen per cent. We thus have the spectacle of a Catholic prelate at the head of a flock of at least 84,000 out of 90,000 Christians whose children form the vast majority in every school whether official or other—joined too in their request by the more religious portion of the other Christian communions—asking in vain for schools such as these Catholic children can be sent to without loss of their most precious possession, their faith—offering to supply abundant schools and the best teachers if only they be allowed fair treatment, a fair share of help, and a fair share also in the attractive advantages now enjoyed exclusively by scholars in Government schools ; and opposed in these just demands by sectarian bigotry, by sad indifference, by puerile fear of priests and a church monopoly, all colluding in this case with the insular antipathies of the governing minority.

It is needless to repeat here for English Catholic readers the unphilosophical, even absurd contentions of statesmen and officials in reply to Catholic objections against education without religion. The Catholic doctrine, that education must be guided by religion, and include that religion as an actual part of its course, is not considered. It is even proposed to abolish grant schools, and multiply the official ones, where liberty of conscience will be cultivated by a studious wounding of the conscience of three-fourths of the community ! To this strange proposal the Anglican Bishop of Mauritius and his diocesan council, have, we regret to say,

lent the weight of their solemn adhesion.* Should this eventually be effected, Catholics will be thrown entirely on their own resources; and the charity of the faithful, already heavily taxed, will, with the utmost generosity and good will—not be equal to supply the enormous demand. There will remain for a large multitude of Catholic children the schools which too large a number at present of necessity frequent. The Protestant gentleman who is Inspector of the Grant-in-Aid schools, who is at the same time Superintendent of the Official schools (a position requiring the simultaneous exercise of diametrically opposite sympathies), supposes there can be no religious objection to the official schools. And this because ministers of all creeds are allowed during one hour a week to instruct their own children in religion; and because in addition, “the first half hour of each school-day is devoted to the preparation of the lessons prescribed by the clergy!” The spectacle of an “Independent or Anglican” teacher, or a teacher of no religion (for Government teachers may be such), zealously superintending the learning of the Catholic catechism, is too edifying to be dreamed of. “A better solution,” says the Inspector of the “conscience” difficulty, “could not, I think, be devised.” (Report, p. 22.) That evil communications corrupt good manners used to be held for a sound practical maxim. If our religion be our treasure, and the only source of pure and graceful lives, what is to be the fate of the seventy-five Mauritian Catholic boys under masters of strict and absolutely unsympathetic neutrality, learning lessons from which *our* religion is rigidly banished, and associating with not only the five Anglicans and two Independents, but with the four Mahomedans, and still worse, with the fourteen “Hindus and others?” Of what avail the one hour’s catechism per week, which will be looked upon by a boy as an additional task and a sort of penalty of his nationality? To call this a “solution” of the religious difficulty which has been “devised,” is surely intended for fine irony.†

Let us hear Dr. Scarisbrick in a letter dated April 30th, 1879, addressed to the Colonial Secretary, the Hon. F. Napier

* “Appendix No. 2 to Minutes of Council No. 31 of 1879.”

† But we have Mr. Pike, who largely uses the Inspector’s Report writing: “The Government schools are professedly secular as to their curriculum of studies, but in most all the ministers of different creeds have ample facilities for instructing the children in their religious duties” (p. 456). The idea of such writers is that a “minister” can pin on any creed to the tail of a creed-less, religion-less education. Our idea that education is one complete and harmonious growth. Religion must throughout affect it, or its absence will irretrievably vitiate it.

Broome on the Report of the Superintendent, from which we have quoted. That Report, by the way, the Bishop writes :

Is, as usual, full of inaccuracies ; and from beginning to end reveals the strong bias of the gentleman so unfortunately placed at the head of the education of our Catholic children :

Appropos of our immediate subject, he writes :

Speculatively, the religion of the child is respected (in Government schools) but in practice the mischievous influence of the teacher acts daily and hourly upon the minds and hearts of the children, and when they leave school the public are not slow to discover that the end aimed at by Government in the costly maintenance, from the public funds, of these schools has not been attained.*

The demands of the Catholics of Mauritius are few and consistent. They ask for a larger annual sum to be devoted to encourage and spread the system of education which they can accept: they suggest what the late Governor himself proposed†—the abolition of some Government schools in less populous centres, and the transfer of the pupils to aid schools. It has just been seen that three times the number of scholars can be educated for the same sum by the latter system ; thus they propose a measure of sound economy. They ask also, and most justly, that in the Council of Education the proportion of Catholic members should correspond with the social and numerical preponderance of the Catholic population—at present it does not—and finally that the grant schools should not have as Inspector the same person who is Superintendent of Government schools. No schools could thrive under a supervision both unfriendly and prejudiced. They seek neither privilege nor monopoly ; nor even the creation of a new system ; they only ask fair play and sympathetic encouragement under a long existing system. On one side, therefore, in the struggle is an absolute majority of the people—morally speaking the whole people—with just demands and fair, petitioning moreover in the name of religion, the only power that can truly educate, and on which the State can rest for aid in its task of government ; on the other side is prejudice, national, and sectarian, and objections that are frivolous, often unfounded. On which side will the victory be ? If Mauritius is once more

* "Appendix No. 3 to Minutes of Council No. 27 of 1879."

† "Minute No. 94 of 1878." In this Minute Sir A. P. Phayre, who made a great and truly liberal effort to help denominational education, acknowledges that aided schools "in many places are very efficient as means of education for the children of the working classes." And that they have "one great advantage" in the "greater proportion of girls whom they educate."

to follow France in her unworthy outbursts of passion, in which as in individuals the lower nature rises into power and clouds reason herself, then, alas, there may be still further repression of every Catholic attempt. Well may the devoted Bishop who now governs the Church here have said that this is "the great anxiety of his ministry." Here as everywhere, the well-being of religion in the next generation depends greatly on the education of the young in this; and here, in addition, on their education will greatly depend the conversion of surrounding heathen to the Church of Jesus Christ. The Governor of the island has lately forwarded his statement on this *vexata questio* to the Colonial Secretary in England, and asked for a final settlement. Perhaps the more recent change of government will again bring delay, but Catholics will not fail both to work and to pray.

The truth is that education without religion is not an advantage even for the heathen. A system of Indian vernacular schools has been commenced on some estates, which Government is to support by grant: the teaching is to have carefully excluded from it all religion, but it is hoped that this mere information will be a boon to the Indian youth, and help to the gradual elevation of the Indian race. But elevation to what? We need not repeat here what has often enough been urged with regard to the action on India of mere school-teaching, divested of all Christianity: that England has taught the Indian to laugh at the religion of his fathers, and left him without any religion in its place to respect. This, however, is the legitimate, and the direct result in its measure, of all undenominational education. It is one thing to destroy Hindus, it is quite another to make Christians. Speaking of the education given to the Indians in India by England, Prof. Monier Williams, says:

I fear the work effected is rather information than education; rather informing the mind than forming the character and raising its tone. This sort of education is, in some cases, better than nothing, but too often it inflates young men with conceit, unhinges their faith in their own religion without giving them any other, leads them to despise the calling of their fathers, and to look upon knowledge as a mere stepping-stone to Government situations which they cannot all obtain.*

This is literally pertinent to the education of Indians and Indian Creoles here, and in a great measure that of the poorer classes. Whether the fears of the late Governor that Indian parents would at once withdraw their children from

* "Modern India and the Indians," by Monier Williams, D.C.L. London, 1878, p. 109.

schools where religion was not carefully excluded be correct or not, at least we know that many parents send their children to our schools. The truth really is, Indians are very fond of Government places and money; but Protestantism, as a religion, cannot inspire an Indian with respect. If anything is to be done for the Christianizing of the Indian races, it must be done by the Catholic Church. There are on this island more than two hundred thousand Indians and Indian Creoles, so that the Christian population is encircled by a pagan population twice as numerous. The Indians are settling down too, and threaten to become *the* element in the colony.* One influence must prevail, either of Paganism or of Christianity. The Indians respect Catholicity—its church, its convent, its priest: they recognize the supernatural. An Indian on the road greets a priest, "Salam Padre," or "Salam Sahib;" even women of the lowest classes generally mark his approach by assuming a reverent demeanour; and these people have great respect for a Catholic Church, and are more graceful than many Christians; frequently saluting it as they pass the door. Nay, they often come to settle their quarrels before the altar! They are a very litigious people, and for mere trifles give the magistrates serious trouble. The Court settlement is often unsatisfactory to both sides in the dispute; then they agree to an appeal to the *bon Dieu* in a Catholic Church, and they buy candles and proceed thither—excited men, women, and children. Lighting the candles before the altar-rails they plead aloud, plaintiff and defendant each for himself! Doubtless they suppose that the actual presence there which they recognize of the Supreme Being (the *bon Dieu* as they say), is judged to be the last available resource for bringing excited litigants to a statement of the mere truth. They are a very superstitious people, especially the Hindus, and their superstition and practices are many of them very degraded and disgusting. Witchcraft, evil-eye, spells, and the like, are firmly believed in, and sometimes individual Indians have asked a priest to bless their houses against the charms, and incantations of their enemies. Their festivals in honour of the goddess Durga and others, are marked by self-torture, and other atrocities, not to say immorality. The ten days of the Mohammadan festival of the Yameh,† are days of revelry, intoxication, and license. When

* See Article in our January No., page 13.

† A description of the Yameh or Moharrum, as observed by the Persian Mohammadans is given in a letter from Constantinople in *The Times* of January 16 of this year, headed "A Religious Ceremony." It shows that these go more earnestly and thoroughly into the work of self-cutting

these are the religious celebrations of a people, we need no description of their private lives. Mr. Pike quotes with approbation the words of an educated Hindu: "The cruel practices (at these festivals) are not worthy of man, and especially of the Mauritian Christian Government, which seems to countenance them, although such monstrous festivals have been nearly put down, even in the superstitious land of India."* But mere repression is negative, and no means of elevating a people: you must at the same time show them a higher channel into which their life and enthusiasm may run, and how they are to make a good use of the powers which are now misdirected. You must give them a noble, spiritual and enticing motive for restraining passions and lawless desires. In a word, you must allow that Church which has before now converted and elevated pagan nations passionately addicted to the superstitious diablerie of their festival days—allow her, the Catholic Church, to work unopposedly for the conversion and elevation of these same Indians. It is a work which the zealous bishop and the devoted priests here, especially the brethren of St. Francis Xavier, have greatly at heart: for the success of which many fervent nuns here daily offer their sacrifices of prayer and labour on the success of which depends much of the future happiness of the colony.

There is then in this crowded island—a British possession—a vast field for the Catholic missionary: a large Catholic fold to be cared for, in which many nations have blended into one religious family, and outside that fold a multitude, more than twice as many in point of numbers, who lie, spiritually, deep in the shadow of death, yet not beyond the reach of light and grace. For one religion only outside themselves have they respect and awe—for the Catholic Church with her priesthood and sacraments. May not this good disposition be cultivated and brought at last to be a means of true conversion? At present, the fields show the promise of an abundant harvest, but the labourers are few.

and wounding than do the Mauritian Indians, but with the latter it yearly changes more and more from a religious ceremony into a mere holiday and season of turbulent and wild revelry.

* "Sub-Tropical Rambles," p. 231, *note*.

ART. V.—DR. WARD'S DOCTRINAL ESSAYS.

Essays on the Church's Doctrinal Authority. By WILLIAM GEORGE WARD, Ph.D. London, Burns & Oates, 1880.

THE eminent man, who was for sixteen years Editor of this REVIEW, has followed up the publication of one volume* of his collected articles by that of a second; and our readers will justly expect that we should give some account of a collection which contains some of the most remarkable papers contributed by their author to one or two of the most exciting controversies of a time now happily gone by. The dozen Essays here reprinted, with some slight additions or curtailments, are concerned chiefly with three subjects—the extent of ecclesiastical infallibility, the historical argument for the Church, and the authority of the scholastic philosophy. The bare enumeration of these titles will suggest to the reader one of the principal points of interest in the book. It is not too much to say that the controversy in each of them—or at least that phase of the controversy with which these Essays deal—is now practically closed. Fifteen years ago we were threatened with a school of English Catholics whose profession it was to be to criticize the Church's utterances, and to protest, openly or silently, against all they could not prove from history and their own reason. Fifteen years ago some people still believed that Anglicanism had its roots in antiquity. And still more recently, the philosophy of St. Thomas of Aquin has been fought over by opposing schools within the Church herself. Now English-speaking Catholics, more widely instructed, and more deeply learned, universally understand that whatever the Church, or the Pope, teaches them must be simply accepted, held, and acted upon. Now, the respectable Patristic argument against Rome has given place to the art of the polemical *chiffonnier*, who collects refuse or creates it, and parades it as the older controversialists used to parade Scripture and the Fathers. And lastly, the question of the scholastics is now practically settled. Towards the conclusion of a period of doubt, and even of danger, and towards the settlement of questions whose settlement is sure to mark the beginning of a great era in Catholicism, it is the glory and the consolation of Dr. Ward to have materially contributed.

* "Essays, Devotional and Scriptural." Burns & Oates.

The volume opens with an interesting "Preliminary Essay," not before published. It is an *Apologia*—by no means apologetic, however—for the rest of the book, and for Dr. Ward's editorship of the DUBLIN REVIEW. To some readers this Essay will seem a little too profuse in its explanations. These explanations are professedly made in the interest of certain "excellent persons" not named, who have taken "grave exception" to several of the Essays here reprinted. Nevertheless, both as a contribution to the history of English Catholicism, and as containing one or two interesting personal details, this Essay will be welcomed. This is what Dr. Ward says of his feelings during the early part of his contest with the *Home and Foreign Review* :—

I had an extremely strong impression on my controversial inferiority to my opponents. . . . I was indubitably their inferior to quite an indefinite extent in literary accomplishments, in general knowledge, in acquaintance with politics and secular history. Even with ecclesiastical history my acquaintance was mainly second-hand. And meanwhile notoriously my style was dull and heavy to an unusual degree. (I do not mean that my style is unsuited for purely scientific discussion, whether theological or philosophical. But where poetry or rhetoric is called for, I am alas! nowhere. Yet even for the due exhibition of speculative truth, poetry and rhetoric are quite indispensable). On reflection, I now think that I greatly overrated the ability of those opponents; very able men though they undoubtedly were. Still more, I under-estimated the intrinsic force possessed by a merely logical exposition of truth, when one is addressing a Catholic audience. Nevertheless at the time I was greatly cowed by the brilliancy and acquirements of those whom I had especially to confront. Moreover, my position was a very invidious one. A Catholic writer has far greater hope of attaining the approval of his co-religionists if he makes it his main work to defend and glorify their then existing position, than if he dwell prominently on what he may consider the doctrinal shortcomings more or less prevalent amongst them. And certainly as a matter of fact (if I may speak colloquially) I received, in the earlier part of my editorship, very many more kicks than halfpence. Both publicly and privately I was visited with a great mass of adverse criticism; while, if there was any considerable number of Catholics who approved the line I took, I had not the good fortune of knowing their existence. The heaviest trial of all was, that persons, whom I profoundly respected, censured my course precisely on the ground of its being injurious to souls. Now there is certainly no limit to self-ignorance: but I am myself hardly aware of any motive which ever prompted me to write a single line, except my desire of forwarding God's cause in the world. It may well be imagined, therefore, how I winced under this particular criticism. After the best attention indeed I could give it—it was quite clear to me (1) that (*ceteris paribus*) God's interests are best promoted by a writer, in proportion as he shall

be more docile to the injunctions and intimations of the Holy See ; and (2) that such docility would necessarily lead him to dwell on those very doctrines which were so much disliked. At the same time, I could not rid my *imagination* of the dread, that at last I might be injuring the very cause which I passionately desired to serve ; and this dread at times made me very unhappy indeed.

Yet on the other hand I should be grossly ungrateful if I ignored the number of kind friends who were ever ready with words of advice when I was perplexed, and with words of sympathy when I was disheartened. In particular there was one immense consolation and encouragement, the value and sustaining force of which I cannot exaggerate. I refer to the fact that my labours as a whole were cordially approved by my two ecclesiastical superiors, Cardinal Wiseman and his successor.—*Preliminary Essay*, pp. 32-3.

Dr. Ward probably knows best when he affirms that there was not "any considerable number of Catholics," at that time who approved the line he took. He had opportunities of knowing how the case really stood, which others could not have had. At the same time, it may be useful, here, to make two remarks. The first is, that the antipathy of a considerable number of Catholics to Dr. Ward's line of argument was not by any means the result of an indisposition to acquiesce in Papal pronouncements. As a matter of practice, English Catholics generally, even at the time when the *Home and Foreign Review* was influential, were disposed to accept whatever the Pope taught. What they did not like was that so much should be made of *infallibility*. You may, on many occasions, be bound to believe a teacher who is not, then and there, infallible. And many English Catholics, whilst acting on this principle, were anxious not to hamper their case against Protestants, by committing themselves to too great an extension of irreformability even in the matters they accepted. There is no need to discuss how far ignorance was at the root of this distinction. On the one hand it is quite certain that Catholics may be obliged, at times, loyally to accept, what may afterwards turn out to be erroneous ; on the other hand to apply this view in taking up one's mental attitude towards the majority of contemporary Pontifical pronouncements in any age, would not only be unsafe and exaggerated, but would destroy the possibility of that childlike submission which alone can lead us to accept doctrinal teaching. But whatever be thought of its justice, this was a distinction which ordinary Catholics acted upon, and by which is explained a good deal of the irritation caused in some quarters by the line of the DUBLIN REVIEW. The second remark is, that Dr. Ward's readers, and in a far greater degree those who did not read him, but accepted him

second-hand, as retailed to them in compressed doses by the critics, who did read him, thought they saw in his writing a disagreeable amount of imputation of motive. They were told that he accused all who differed from him of disloyalty to the Church, of rationalism, of exaggerating the claims of the intellect at the expense of the heart, and of "material" mortal sin. There is no doubt that there was much irritation, much impatience, and also a good deal of honest ignorance of theology, on the side of those who disagreed with Dr. Ward. But these considerations explain, in some degree, why feeling was as much aroused as it was.

Having said this much, it will be interesting to follow Dr. Ward through his "Preliminary Essay," and, without again going into the merits of the subjects discussed, to place clearly before the reader what may be considered to have been the distinct gain of the Church in England through his writings and exertions.

The controversial point which comes out most prominently in the volume before us, is, undoubtedly, the treatment of the Church's infallibility in her practical teaching, or, as Dr. Ward calls it, in her *magisterium*, both theological and popular; and perhaps the learned and profound writer has done nothing in his theological career so useful and so excellent as his establishment of this most vital truth. He thus explains what he understands by the doctrine of the infallibility of the ordinary *magisterium* of the Church:

Catholics throughout the world are instructed in certain *doctrines*; are exhorted to certain *practices*; are encouraged and trained in certain *tempers* and *dispositions*. The Church's office in providing for this is called her "magisterium;" being that function whereby, as Perrone expresses it, "she leads them, as it were, by the hand, along the path of eternal salvation." "*Catholics contend*," he adds, "*all non-Catholics deny*, that Christ has endowed His Church with *Infallibility* in this respect"—("De Locis," n. 347-8). Now firstly, when we say that this magisterium is *trustworthy*—we mean (1) that the *doctrines* so taught are really truths revealed by God, or legitimate inferences therefrom; (2) that the *practices* thus inculcated are really serviceable for sanctification and salvation; and (3) that the *tempers* and *dispositions* so encouraged are really acceptable to Almighty God. And, secondly, when we further say that this magisterium is not *trustworthy* only, but *infallible*—we mean that its trustworthiness is guaranteed by God's infallible promise.

Here, however, certain explanations are necessary. When we say that the Church's magisterium is infallible, we do not of course deny, that each several priest throughout Christendom falls probably into one mistake or another, on various minor matters connected with religion. For to deny this, would be almost to maintain that each

several priest is infallible. Nor yet do we deny, that in one or other portion of the Church most serious doctrinal corruptions and heresies may arise; may infect priests and even bishops; and may give the supreme authority great trouble, before they are finally repressed. For to deny this would be to deny facts, which are on the surface of ecclesiastical history from first to last. But all this being fully admitted and allowed for, it still remains true that, in every part of the Catholic Church, there is a large mass of such practical guidance as we have described, given to the people by their priests, with fullest knowledge and approval of the Church's supreme authority.—*Essays*, p. 178.

No one could dream of supposing that the doctrine here expressed was novel sixteen years ago, or say that it has not been explicitly taught in the classes of our Catholic Colleges since their foundation. But there are one or two reasons why it was somewhat passed over, or not fully brought out, until about the date of the celebrated Munich Brief, of 1863. The first was, that our controversial position required us (as it seemed) to be content with as little as possible, in the way of admissions, from those Protestants whom we wished to convert. It was considered—very justly—that one of the first things to do for non-Catholics, is to get them to look Catholicism fairly in the face; and that some very small matter, some dogmatic corollary, or some fervent devotion, may scare them so much at the outset as to prevent them from all calm examination whatever. Thereupon there grew up a disposition on the part of some polemical writers to be very emphatic in *defined* Catholic doctrine, and to dismiss as unimportant everything that was not defined, or *de fide*. It must be said, however, that not one of our prominent controversialists has, as far as we know, ever committed himself to the assertion that nothing in the Church's system need be accepted, except what was actually defined. There is no trace of it in Gother, in Milner, in Hay, or in Lingard, or in any of those numerous catechisms, tracts, and discussions, which have been published during the present century. If they dwelt most on defined dogmas, it was because defined dogma was most assailed, because it was impossible to say everything, and because, after all, "ordinary magisterium," as commonly used, is a phrase which covers a large body of practical teaching, many details of which are not authoritative at all, but shade off into mere pious opinions, or even, at times, touch upon abuse and superstition.

The rise, amongst English Catholics, of a school of brilliant but unsound thinkers, forced the Bishops at length to speak with emphatic force on the question of the Church's ordinary practical teaching. That school was not the produce of this

country, or of any hereditary taint, or corrupt home education. It came from abroad. About forty years ago, young English Catholics of fortune and position began to resort to Munich, and to sit at the feet of Döllinger, Haneberg, and other eminent professors. The want of higher education at home forced them to this. We now know what sort of a "virus," as Dr. Ward would call it, these ardent young men went to imbibe. The spirit of Dr. Döllinger's teaching is summed up and exhibited in his address as President of the well-known assembly of learned men at Munich in 1863, which was the occasion of the *Brief Tuas libenter*. It may be epitomized in three words—research, independence, and criticism; his pupils were to get hold of every fact they could, to arrive at independent conclusions from their facts, and to test by them both the teaching of the pastorate, and the common belief of the faithful—formal definitions alone excepted. This apostleship of Gnosticism soon became a real danger amongst ourselves. Young men returned to England, the clever ones bitten by it, the stupid ones bewildered and paralyzed, and the one or two really able disciples fully prepared to start a propaganda. It was at the time that conversions from among the more cultivated members of the Anglican Church were frequent. There were not wanting among those converts men who had greater intellectual power than they had truly Catholic spirit; and these, joining with the Munich men, were the founders and conductors of those various organs, the *Rambler*, the *Home and Foreign Review*, the *North British Review*, the *Chronicle*, which combined with very great literary power the most dangerous spirit of unbelief that the present century has witnessed.

It is doubtful, however, whether Dr. Ward does not make too much of the danger. He speaks ("Prelim. Essay," p. 4) of the "singularly critical period at which these pernicious utterances began to be heard. Catholic intellect in England was beginning to bestir itself after the paralysis with which the penal laws had visited it." It is surely an exaggeration to speak as if English and Irish Catholics were in a state of paralysis up to 1862. The Munich writers were probably in advance of contemporary Catholics in many matters of scholarship and learning, and even in point of literary ability. But it must be remembered, when speaking of danger, that in 1862 we already had a generation imbued with the intense Catholic spirit and genius of Wiseman, infected by the enthusiastic "Romanism" of Faber, and cultured by the wide and luminous exposition of Newman. It is not to be supposed that the rank and file of priests and educated laymen did not, to a very

great extent, gauge and appreciate at their true worth the solemn or the florid heterodoxy of the new school. It is true that for a considerable time no one spoke. But men were waiting—for the Bishops. At length, in 1862, at the moment the *Rambler* was passing into the *Home and Foreign Review*, Cardinal Wiseman, Bishop Ullathorne, and other Bishops, published elaborate criticisms on the new methods and their consequences. It happened at that time that the DUBLIN REVIEW was not in a position to do effective work. Old editors had gone, and new ones had not arrived. Happily for English Catholicism, Dr. Ward accepted the editorship in 1862, "within a month" of Cardinal Wiseman's address. The new editor set to work to do what no editor worthy of the name could have omitted to do, to place before his public the unsound teaching of the German School, and, by the help of theology, philosophy, and the Bishops, to demolish it. This work Dr. Ward performed with conspicuous ability and unflinching clearness of perception. In the following year the Munich Brief came out, and his task was easier still. And, all the time, there can be no doubt that, so far at least as he followed and amplified the strictures of the Bishops, he had the vast majority of Catholics with him.

But this is not by any means to say that such a task was really easy, or that Dr. Ward has not added immensely to the definite appreciation of the whole subject. Indeed, he has created a literature in reference to this matter. He has laid down the theological and philosophical grounds for the important doctrine of which we speak; he has pursued it into its consequences; he has unravelled the objections of hostile critics; he has gone into the subject of "modern liberties;" he has upheld the Church's power to pronounce on certain questions of science; he has found the root of the minimizing view to be the wrong conception of man's last end; and he has followed into minute detail the questions which concern the "spirit of the Church," the "sensus fidelium" and Catholic instincts. His fertility of thought is very remarkable. One of his most singular powers is that of "amplification." This power, which may be described as the gift of evolving complete situations, given one situation and the general direction in which circumstances are moving, is an endowment of the imagination. Dr. Ward fervently disdains, in a passage already quoted, all capability of poetry or rhetoric; but certainly Aristotle would recognize him as a rhetorician. He "divides" with great facility and fertility; and some of his illustrations are among the happiest to be found in any philosophical writer. In the exposition of abstract principles, such a gift is of the highest importance. Dr. Ward, no

doubt, has written a great deal that is far from being light reading. But this is because he writes on subjects which cannot be treated lightly. To any one who is fairly capable of following him, Dr. Ward is never dry. He has, to begin with, a mind that is never satisfied till it knows what it knows. He is singularly honest, not only with his readers and his opponents, which is common enough, but with himself, which is less common. Having the power of vivid and clear thinking, it is no wonder that he has the faculty of vigorous presentment. It is this quality of strong perception which gives his style its logical power. Reasoning, after all, is only the power of seeing explicitly what is implicitly contained in premisses. Dr. Ward, whether by means of hard labour, or by a happy native gift, seems to see his premisses solidly or stereoscopically. The weakness of human "discourse" is, that in passing from one thing to another the mind loses its hold on what has already been considered, and so the mental picture has only lines or surfaces. The strength of a strong reasoner is to hold always what he has once made out, until reasoning seems to become sight. Dr. Ward has brought these gifts to the discussion, or rather to the exposition, of the great Catholic verity that the Church is infallible in her ordinary practical teaching and system, as well as in her definitions. Those who have followed him in his contributions to the DUBLIN REVIEW, or who now follow his republished essays, have to thank him for giving them a good and clear map of a subject which before, perhaps, they possessed only in outline, or with many a *lacuna* and blurred division.

The complete setting-forth of the doctrine here referred to, has had an important influence in more quarters than one. As Dr. Ward observes when he undertook the DUBLIN REVIEW, "the movement in favour of what some persons called 'corporate reunion,' was in full swing." Dr. Pusey was entreating the Catholic Church to reject and disavow a large part of the doctrine implied in her practical system on the ground that such doctrines had not been defined. And some Catholics, most estimable men in many respects, were countenancing Dr. Pusey, as if a union in the terms of "definitions only" had been possible. There was danger in this—the danger, not that Dr. Pusey and his followers would ever have come over on such an understanding, but that a low, or (as Dr. Ward calls it,) "minimizing" view of the Church's infallible teaching might come to prevail among English Catholics.

By the phrase, "minimizing tenets," I always intended to designate those tenets which tend towards the proposition, that the Church is infallible only in what are most strictly called "definitions

of faith;" that she is not infallible in her ordinary magisterium, nor again in branding any given dictum with some censure other than the special censure "heretical."—*Preliminary Essay*, p. 23.

He was anxious to prevent Catholics from seeming to surrender Catholic truth for the sake of a few conversions—a surrender which would most certainly operate in the long run to put a stop to conversions; but he was even more anxious to unite Catholics among themselves in a hearty acceptance of all Roman teaching.

What I myself felt throughout, and expressed in various shapes, was this. An internecine conflict is at hand, between the army of Dogma, and the united hosts of indifferentism, heresy, atheism: a conflict which will ultimately also (I am persuaded) turn out to be a conflict between Catholic Theism on one side and atheism of this or that kind on the other. Looking at things practically—the one solid and inexpugnable fortress of truth is the Catholic Church, built on the Rock of Peter. But we cannot submit to the Church's authority by halves. We cannot accept what we please, and reject what we please. By rebelling against one part of her doctrine, we rebel against her doctrinal authority itself. But by rebelling against her doctrinal authority, we lay open our one position of security, and become an easy prey to our enemies. The Church's power as witness of the Truth cannot be duly brought into practical action, except so far as the Truth which she teaches is set forth in its full and genuine proportions. Its power, I say, cannot be brought into due action if we choose merely to exhibit what after all are but fragments of her teaching; and very far less if these fragments be united with other tenets which she actually condemns, whether that condemnation be definitional or merely magisterial. Such is the lesson which I had learned from my old friend F. Faber; and with which I have always sympathized most entirely.—*Preliminary Essay*, pp. 24–5.

Following out the line here indicated, Dr. Ward, in the numerous articles which he wrote on matters more or less closely connected with the now forgotten "Eirenicon" of Dr. Pusey, has not only drawn out the historical argument for the truth of Catholicism in a most cogent and useful fashion, but has devoted much space to an equally important subject—the exposition, for the benefit of Anglicans, of Catholic *spirit*. To Anglicans, and to Unionists also, he has said, in effect, "You must take the Church as she is, not as you say she ought to be. You must take her as she is, in her actual devotions, sermons, and (universal) popular beliefs; not as you might construct her out of patrologies and encyclopædias." This language was most certainly justifiable, and quite necessary. In spite of the Church's extreme tenderness for souls, she has never, at any period of her history, suffered herself even to treat, much less make a compromise, with heresy itself. The reason is, because

heresy which would treat or bargain must be heresy still. Its very essence is rebellion, and until it submits it exists. Individual teachers or missionaries may be, and should be, tenderly solicitous not to scare individual souls. But the moment that anything like public attention is called to the question of what is, or is not, Catholic teaching, public preachers and writers, and much more the authorities of the Church herself, have no choice but to say plainly out what she requires in those who seek admission to her fold. The consequence of acting in any other way would be to introduce a "solvent" into Catholic dogma, which would not stop at the destruction of popular beliefs, but would be equally powerful against everything but the most formal definitions of faith. Nay, such principles would destroy the Catholic Church; for it would set up two Churches—a Church of the "instructed" minority, and a Church of the unthinking people. And that such plain speaking about Our Lady, for instance, about the Sacred Heart, or about Papal Definitions should operate in checking conversions would be an evil to be lamented, if it were true. But there seems no ground for saying that such a thing ever happens. There is no parallel between the individual missionary, and public pastoral teaching, preaching, or journalism. Individuals have strong feelings, prejudices, and weaknesses, which the missionary must not irritate or contradict (where this is possible). The public, also, has its weaknesses and prejudices; but the public attempt to keep clear of them by toning down doctrine or practice, would only beget public contempt, or indeed, public aversion, as soon as the attempt was found out. And, when one deals with the public, such an attempt must be found out. It must not be understood, for one moment, that, even with individual converts, doctrine is to be "minimized;" but it is true that, partly from the impossibility of going into every thing, and partly from the certainty that a given soul has the true spirit of the Faith, certain questions may be, and ought to be, only lightly treated, when individual conversions are in question. The true spirit of the Catholic faith is the readiness to accept all that the Church has proposed, does propose, or may at any time propose, whether this be gathered from definition, or ordinary magisterium. With a whole community, which has eyes everywhere, the existence of such a spirit for any length of time is incompatible with an aversion for any region of Catholic doctrine. The public sees, the public knows; the facts cannot be concealed; the Catholic Church is seen and known to live up to, and act upon a certain body of beliefs and practices, and he who attempts to hoodwink the public, only

brings on confusion and disaster. The confusion arises from the fact that, when once you admit an inner and outer Catholicism there is no solid ground to stand on; and the disaster is, the apparent assertion that people may become Catholics without making up their minds to enter as living members into the actual life of the living Church.

At the same time, only a fanatic would assert that all things may properly and prudently be insisted on at all times. And no sound theologian would maintain that the forms of Catholic life, as they are subject to the influences of national language, for instance, and national taste, are the essential and vital clothing of Catholic belief. The following passage from Dr. Ward's Essay on "Projects of Corporate Union," well expresses the carefulness of the Church herself in the "proposition" of doctrine; her carefulness, that is, not to lay too startling an emphasis on matters which nevertheless all her children who are at once docile enough and sufficiently instructed, may recognize that she really teaches.

(The Church) is the one ark of salvation; and she must open her doors as widely as possible to all who desire heaven. Here then is her difficulty. Every new doctrinal decision, however necessary, yet erects a fresh barrier against the salvation of individuals; and she is always desirous therefore, to the utmost possible extent, of preserving dogmatic purity by some different means. Take, as one very principal instance, the various doctrines concerning our Blessed Lady, which she practically teaches. Almost all Catholics, who accept the infallible truth of these doctrines, will piously believe that Christ taught them to the Apostles. Yet if the Church formally declared this—if she pronounced them as so many distinct matters of faith—much evil must arise. There is many a well-intentioned, but half-hearted, or puzzle-headed, or eccentric Catholic, who might shrink from accepting these propositions, when thus rigidly and (as it were) coldly put into scientific shape, and who might thus be seriously tempted to apostasy. Nevertheless such a man, if remaining a Catholic, might receive indefinite benefit from the Church's Sacraments and teaching; might probably save his soul; and would at all events educate as Catholics his children, to become perhaps far more loyal sons of the Church than himself. Still more importantly, there is many a non-Catholic, who, as things now are, will submit to the Church; will receive her sweet and gradual training; and under its influence, will learn to sympathize with every high devotion to the Mother of God; who might not have had the heart to make so great a venture, had those various truths, which he has thus unconsciously imbibed, been presented to him at first in the nakedness of theological Decree. And moreover, after all, no such Decree could really have conveyed to his mind the true doctrine, in that fulness and precision with which faithful Catholics really hold it. Why then should the Church throw

obstacles in the way of such persons? What fear is there, that they will impede the general reception of integral and pure and what we may call "maximistic" doctrine, concerning Holy Mary? That doctrine (thank God!) lives in the heart of the Catholic masses; and any individual is absolutely powerless (even if he wished it) to stem the popular tide.—*Essays*, pp. 196–199.

The only fault we feel inclined to find with Dr. Ward, in reference to his admirable exposition of the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church's ordinary magisterium, is, that he hardly recognizes with sufficient clearness the difficulty there is, and must be, in very many instances, of deciding what is, or is not, actually included in the scope of that magisterium. The Church teaches by the mouths of men. Bishops publish pastorals, priests preach and instruct, theologians write, professors teach, Catholic journalists publish their articles, the faithful, as the days and years go on, use their prayer-books and follow their devotions. These things, in the aggregate, express the ordinary practical belief (and therefore the ordinary authoritative magisterium) of the Church. But any one of these organs of teaching or of witness to teaching, may, in individual cases, fall into corruption and error; and such error may even assume considerable local diffusion at a given time. We are very far indeed from denying that Dr. Ward sees and teaches this; and the reader may be referred to the same Essay from which an extract has just been made (pp. 200–1) for an admirably drawn out series of samples of three different degrees of Church teaching in regard to our Lady; that is to say, first, those doctrines concerning her (not formally defined) which are taught "authoritatively and therefore infallibly;" secondly, those which, if not actually taught by the Church with infallible authority, are yet so universally held by devout servants of Mary, that no "cordatus Catholicus" would dream of doubting them; and, lastly, those "pious opinions" which have been advocated by this or that individual, with the Church's full permission. Dr. Ward distinguishes between these classes with great clearness, giving some very well-chosen examples of the two former. But to make such distinctions requires considerable reading, training, and thought. It is quite possible that numberless Catholics, whilst perfectly agreeing with him in his premisses, would feel that in this or that particular instance there was exaggeration or mistake, and that he was extending the area of (the details of) infallibility further than there was warrant for. The matter is one that is, of its own nature, extremely difficult of proof. Whether this or that expression of devotion, for instance, has been used with sufficient frequency, by a sufficient number of sincere Catholics, the Pastorate being sufficiently aware of it—the

discussion of this, we repeat, is not easily made conclusive. It is an impression we derive from Dr. Ward's writings as a whole, that, in practice, he somewhat overlooks this point. If that be so, and if others have the same impression, it is easy to account for the existence of a certain amount of repulsion to his doctrinal writings. And what we say in regard to the subject matter of the Church's magisterium may also be said of the "dicta" in a Papal instruction, that there is often considerable practical difficulty in knowing whether such "dicta" are "obiter dicta" only, or formal pronouncements; or, indeed, in recognizing what pronouncements are *ex Cathedrâ* and what are not.

Whilst admitting that the discussion of some of the matters which Dr. Ward has so ably treated has caused, in some cases, irritation and opposition, we are confident that the complete ventilation of such a burning subject as Papal infallibility has done a great deal of good. Dr. Ward is so well prepared at all points, that it is very rare to find him wrong in what he positively puts forth, or in a citation which he makes. All that people can do, is to complain of "his tone," and the "unmannerly strength" of his language. There are, scattered through this volume before us, various minor retractions, and one or two apologies which we have not taken the trouble to collect. The prevailing spirit of this book is to find out "what saith the Church;" and it is a monument of learning, of zeal, and of true Catholic devotedness.

It should be added that, besides a translation of his Latin pamphlet, "On the Extent of Definitional Infallibility," the learned author has added other new matter in the shape of, first, an Inquiry into the "Doctrinal Authority of the Syllabus," and secondly, an answer to the question, "Are Infallible Definitions rare?"

ART VI.—ST. CATHERINE OF SIENA.

The History of St. Catherine of Siena, and her Companions.

By AUGUSTA THEDOSIA DRANE, Author of "Christian Schools and Scholars." London: Burns and Oates. 1880.

IN the publication of a life of the Virgin of Siena, Catherine, the Spouse of Christ, there seems to be at the present time a threefold fitness. The reason most apparent is, that the year 1880 has seen the celebration of her fifth centenary, the close of five hundred years since she went forth to meet the Bridegroom after a life that might be called at once secret in her circle of disciples, and publicly laborious even in the political world, a lifelong martyrdom, and an all but incessant ecstasy. As a second reason, it is fitting that this marvellous history should be made known in order to spread the enthusiasm of the saint for the cause of "the Christ on earth," and for the City of Rome, and to revive devotion to her, whom Pius IX. of holy and glorious memory, proclaimed the secondary patroness of the Eternal City. In her days the desolating schism of the fourteenth century, seen in the clear vision of her perfection of faith, appeared in itself so hideous a sight, and so fraught with disaster to souls, that she offered her whole being as a holocaust for the unity of the Holy See, and death consummated the sacrifice of a body and soul worn out with suffering. In our days, the schism of the anti-Popes is buried under the dust of centuries; and the jealousies of nations, and the changes of the political world, appear as transitory as shifting shadows in comparison with the one world-amazing reality, the greatest power on earth—the strong unity of the Church under one immortal and unquestioned headship. But though we witness the spiritual triumph of that See of Peter, for which Catherine of Siena gave her life, who amongst us needs to be reminded that in our day also, though in a far different and less deplorable manner, there exists a central evil crying for redress: that, so long as it lasts, the very name of Rome is a sound of sorrow? What the Saint of Siena saw, we also see—a thorn-crowned Vicar of Christ;* and it is our dishonour if we forget that

* "Veggio
 E nel Vicario Cristo esser catto,
 Veggio un'altra volta esser deriso
 Veggio rinovellar l'aceto e'l fiele."

Il Purgatorio, xx.

Pius IX. passed on to his successor, not only the tiara, but the still more royal crown. The life of the Church is no longer free in its heart centre; a secular power, itself only the pioneer of fresh revolution, has fettered the hands of him whom our saint solemnly revered as "the dispenser of the Blood." We cannot measure the wrongs summed up in the name of the Christian capital, whose very dust there was a Pontiff found to bestow as a relic; we have no statistics to reckon the invisible; no means of knowing how far the huge wrong is influencing for the worse the world's under-currents that shape events. We can only count the lapse of time by the increase of our ardour for the perfect freedom, temporal as well as spiritual, of the Holy See; while yearly when the Church echoes the lamentations of the prophet over the Mistress of the Nations left desolate with none to comfort her, the first outburst of unreproving grief brings to our mind, not so much the image of Jerusalem, as the memory of the city that ten years ago was Rome.

The second special fitness of studying anew in these times St. Catherine's life, lies then in the fact that no one can become familiar with it without feeling the fascination, not only of her unspeakably privileged soul, but of its warmth of sympathy; and no one can be truly devoted to her, without being also devoted to Rome. Her enthusiasm in effecting the return of Gregory XI. from Avignon to war-wrecked Italy, was not national but Catholic; and like all enthusiasm born of faith it did not stop with the first victory. There was no rest for her generous devotion till, when Rome had once more received the Pontiff, her final holocaust was offered for the peace of the Church. But there is more here for us than the influence of her royal-hearted ardour. Beyond the accepted sacrifice, the records of history give a consoling glimpse of deep mysteries by showing how long the schism still lasted, and then how utterly it disappeared. There is every reason to believe that the voluntary suffering and heroic death of that saint of predilection, was efficacious in ending the Great Schism; yet it was not until thirty-four years after her death that the schism was healed at the Council of Constance, by the resignation of the lawful Pope, Gregory XII., the deposition of the two pretenders, John XXII. and Benedict VIII., and the election of one universally acknowledged Pontiff, Martin V. The lapse of thirty-four years, and then the complete answer of the saint's prayer, ought to be a lesson to those who are too ready to be deluded by the doctrine of "*faits accomplis*."

To pass on from the devotional use of the life of Rome's secondary patroness, there is a third point of appropriateness

to the present time. The "popolana" of Siena, with her mystic and supernatural character, at first unconsciously and then openly becoming a power in the world, until she was the counsellor of Popes, the ambassador of Republics, the adviser of Kings—this "daughter of the people" is a fourteenth-century type of a truth that still asserts itself in the nineteenth, the power acquired even in human affairs by simple faith. It is not too much to say that the one great need of our time is precisely the grand prerogative of St. Catherine, the perfection of faith, for therein seems to lie now more than ever the victory that overcomes the world. In this age with its marked taste for philosophical research and theological discussion, with its tendency on the one hand, away from the ephemeral sects and back to the Church, and on the other, away from all revealed religion, and down into hopeless dust-to-dust utilitarianism, or to a modern luxurious paganism, or to the half-way haze of theistic dreamy systems—it is the hour when wonders are worked by simple outspoken faith, making known the one single system that can boast both antiquity and consistency. If there is abundant proof of rank infidelity around us, there are also tokens everywhere of a thirst for the knowledge of the invisible. And if it was appropriate to the time that we should have seen a veritable Lumen in Cœlo, in the direction of Catholic study afresh to the Angel of the Schools, it is also appropriate that there should be encouragement for all that tends towards a popular study of the highest types of the supernatural life, since such a study is at once in keeping with the new sympathies of the age, and in direct contradiction of its opposite materialistic tendency. Therefore the mystic life of the virgin of Siena attracts us in these days with a more than ordinary fascination; for though it is true that the life of any saint is an exposition of the supernatural order, and a victory of faith, there are few such brilliant examples of faith and asceticism acquiring power for an individual, who by natural gifts alone could have effected nothing, and could not even have had any *raison d'être* in the political world.

As to the manner in which the life of a saint is best written, there exists some difference of opinion. It is well known that most of the religious biographies, which are ranked among the classics of asceticism, are arranged with a view to spiritual teaching alone. Their main object is to describe the soul and interior life of the saint; and they classify virtues rather than events, so that beyond the principal outline there is but a slight thread of chronological sequence, and the attention is not distracted from the main purpose by any lengthy digression towards the material world, much less by any appeal to the

imagination to reconstruct its aspect at the time. Such lives form the treasures of hagiology. But a different method is often necessary when the career of the saint was public and eventful; and the modern spirit of research has given to our literature many noble works, which, without losing their spiritual influence, produce the effect, not so much of the revelation of a soul, as of the bodily resurrection of a saintly life and a bygone time. To this latter class belongs the *History of St. Catherine*, and there are few more perfect specimens of religious biography. The materials found for this life of five hundred years ago were unusually copious and detailed; the present volume is made more generally readable by containing much of the descriptive and discursive element, while it contains also as full an account of the saint's virtues and mystical teaching as could be desired by a seeker of pure and simple hagiology. The public character of her mission, her sorrow over the woes of the Church, the peculiar nature of her relationship with her "family" of disciples, could not have been adequately represented in a mere *Life of St. Catherine*. There was but one manner of faithfully depicting this marvellous figure in the mediæval Church, and explaining her unique position; and that manner is here indicated by the title, telling, as it does, not of a saint's life detached from the world, but of the saint in her place in the world, left among her proper surroundings of time, place, and people. Such is the scope of the *History of St. Catherine of Siena and her Companions*.

Although the story of the Saint of Siena has been told in foreign tongues by more than sixty publications of her life, for English readers there existed hitherto only an imperfect American abridgment of the legend, and a translation of it made by Father John Fen in 1609, re-edited of late years, and now some time out of print. Beside these two brief and almost unattainable versions of the *Legend of Raymund of Capua*, there is one other in English—a recently published Protestant *Life*, as unsatisfactory as the view of a beautiful stained glass window seen only from outside, with reversed design and unlighted colours. The one standard English work on *St. Catherine* has at last been given to us, and how a wide subject is grasped and materials held in hand, intricacies unravelled and deep things charmingly simplified, is all said in saying that it comes from the author of "*Christian Schools and Scholars*." The groundwork has been the so-called legend written by the saint's confessor, Raymund of Capua, and her own letters and those of her disciples; but the extent to which all extant records that illustrate her life have been compared and ex-

hausted, can be judged by the bare enumeration in the Preface, where we see reference to many unpublished manuscripts, the originals of which are laid up in the libraries of Siena and Rome: or it is indicated by such evidence of research as the reasons given for the belief that St. Catherine wrote a letter of advice to Richard II. of England, and the extract cited from the Rolls of Parliament referring to the "*plusours grantz et notables resons*" for England's fidelity to "*nostre saint Pere Urban*." But the direct compilation from original sources, and the abundance of materials brought together, would only have produced an unsatisfying confusion of riches, had there not been that rare merit, an admirable faculty for arrangement; so that not only is the history of the mediæval life as flowing and lucid as a modern story, but the chronological order ignored by Raymund of Capua himself, is for the first time entirely restored. The mystic life is told to a great extent in the words of the saint herself by means of her letters and her famous "*Dialogue*." But even when we are wellnigh dazzled by her supernatural privileges, we are always caught back most happily to the truth that the being all but lost in divine light is still of human nature moulded in the common mould. Well is it said here that an injustice is done to the saints by those who represent them as strangers to human emotions, "whereas we judge that the Saint of saints Himself suffered beyond our utmost capacity of comprehension, precisely because, above all men, He possessed most of that keen sensibility which gives the power of suffering." No such injustice is done here; and it is one of the greatest charms of this biography, that even where the very grandeur of the subject must have made difficult the task of keeping its human character, that character has been perfectly preserved, with the result of giving a vivid impression of a distinct individual personality. It is stated that the object was not so much to present a complete history of the age of St. Catherine, as to make the reader better acquainted with the saint herself.

Stupendous as is the story of her life, it has, nevertheless, a side which brings her within the reach of ordinary sympathies. Catherine, the Seraphic Bride of Christ, espoused to Him at Siena; stigmatised at Pisa; supported on the Bread of Life; the Pacifier of Florence; the Ambassador of Gregory; the Councillor of Urban; the Martyr for the unity of the Holy See—this is indeed a character that overwhelms us with its very greatness. But Catherine, the Lover of God and man, who gave away her will with her heart to her Divine Spouse; the tender mother of a spiritual family; the friend of the poor; the healer of feuds, the lover of her country—Catherine with all her natural gifts of prudence and womanly tact; with her warm

affections and her love of the beautiful; with her rare genius refined, spiritualized, and perfected by Divine illumination; surrounded by men and women like ourselves, with whose infirmities she bore, and whom she loved as heartily as they loved her in return; Catherine, with her wise and graceful words, her "gracious smile," and her sweet attractive presence—this is indeed a being to be loved and imitated; we open our very hearts to receive her within them, and to enshrine her there, not as a saint only but as a mother and a friend.*

Add to this tempting indication of the subject, the fact that the living effect of the whole is legitimate and true, because there is a strict avoidance of all imaginary detail, all heightening of colour, in a word, of anything for which there is not unimpeachable authority—and we have some idea beforehand of the attractive manner in which the English reader is at last shown her, who was not only the greatest daughter of St. Dominic, and the model of myriads since in heroic sanctity,† but also even from a worldly point of view, one of the most remarkable women of the Middle Ages.

The narrative naturally divides itself into three parts:—St. Catherine at Siena; St. Catherine's Embassies; and the Great Schism. The home-life of the saint, her growth in holiness, the power of her prayers, the magnificent favours bestowed on her, her charity to the sick and suffering, and her mission of peace among the feuds of her time—all these are comprised in the first period of the history, though by no means forming only the first period of her life, since they bring us to the eve of the greatest development of her public mission, when she had lived through twenty-eight of her brief life's thirty-three years. First rises before us the hill-city of Siena with its old walls and red-brick towers, the most unchanged of all the cities of Italy, with the Duomo and the church of St. Dominic still crowning its higher ground, the torrent of the Tressa still flowing past the walls; southward in the distance, the rugged heights of Radicofani and Monte Amiata, and northward the plains of Tuscany—"that immense horizon which has its transparent vastness for its solitary beauty." Later we are shown the central space of the city, the Piazza del Campo of the days of the Sienese Republic, now (alas!) the Piazza Vittorio Emanuele, where yet stands as of old the Palazzo Pubblico with its lofty campanile. Within, the fading frescoes of the Sala della Pace are traced for us again, to remind us of the time when the practical meaning of those allegories of concord, wisdom, and magnanimity, was taught by a humble

* Preface, xix.

† For a remarkable resemblance, see the Life of S. Rose, of Lima, the first canonized saint of the New World.

virgin to "the Magnificent Lords Defenders of the people." Outside, the Fonte Gaja is shown, now decorated with the bas-reliefs of Jacopo della Quercia, but far more rich in associations than in art, for many a day must Catherine, the Mantellata, have passed it, on her way to the scaffold of the condemned, or to the home of the plague-stricken. Truly, "localities are solemn things. We perish, and they endure: they stand now as they stood centuries ago, with a thousand memories hanging about their walls: memories of things that perish not, when all that is mortal of us has fallen into dust: the fire of genius, the self-devotion of the patriot, the heroism of the saint." But most of all, the heroism of the saint; for the saint alone is in immortality an active living power for the self-same interests that absorbed the mortal life, when the devotion of the patriot is no more than a soul-stirring memory, and the fire of genius a vanishing dream; for time must one day level the campanile, and steal the colour from the wall, and even wear away the forms of sculpture—of all man's handiwork the nearest to the immortal—but when will the day come when the work and living maternal love of Catherine the saint will cease in human souls; or when Siena will not be famed because of the lowly daughter of Benincasa the dyer: or when "Catherina Sponsa Christi" will be no longer the name giving the little Tuscan city a world-wide renown? At this day the pilgrim is met there at every turn by memories of her. The house known as the Fullonica, her father's house, bears over its door the glorious title *Sponsæ Christi Katherinæ Domus*. Every apartment once consecrated by her presence has been preserved with scrupulous care, "her father's workshop, the stairs she often ascended on her knees, the kitchen where she discharged her humble household duties, the chamber she was permitted to use as a chapel, and the little cell which for so many years was the scene of her prayers, her penances, and the marvels of her daily intercourse with God." Not far off, in the street called the Cortone, is the inscription, marking the spot where Catherine stood as a child of six years, when she saw, as if on the gable of the Dominican Church, Christ blessing her from His throne of majesty—the vision which so filled her with light and love, that created things had henceforth no charm for her who had once beheld the glory of Christ; and at the age of seven, with something like the maturity of reason, drawn by the might of that vision, she vowed herself to virginity that He might be her Spouse. Some thirteen years after, when she was about twenty years of age, came the fruition and visible acceptance of that vow, the mystic espousals which have since formed the theme of many a painter striving

vainly to tell in earthly form and colour what the contemplative prayer of five centuries has dwelt upon, sounding yet not to the depths the indescribable mystery of the soul's union with the Spouse. In the narrative of the vision, two points to be noted are, that it occurred when Catherine was making reparation on the last day of the carnival, and that, the original vow having been addressed through Mary and before her image, it was the same Mother that offered the saint's hand to the Lover of souls and besought Him to accept her.

To which He consented with a very sweet and lovely countenance and taking out a ring that was set about with four precious pearls and had in the other part a marvellous rich diamond, He put the same on the finger of her right hand, saying thus, "Behold I here espouse thee to me, thy Maker and Saviour, in faith, which shall continue in thee from this time forward, evermore unchanged, until the time shall come of a blissful consummation in the joys of heaven. Now then, act courageously: thou art armed with faith, and shalt triumph over all thine enemies." The vision disappeared, but the ring invisible indeed, to other eyes than Catherine's, remained upon her finger; mysterious token of a favour no less mysterious. If every faithful soul is knit to its Creator by the tie of a spiritual espousal, what must not have been the closeness of that union, which Catherine contracted when she received as her dowry "the perfection of faith."

The presence of the ring upon the holy virgin's finger must not be forgotten when, in after years, she put to shame the splendour of the courtiers of Avignon, or spoke as one having power before the assembled governors in the Palazzo Vecchio of Florence; nor must we forget what was visible also to Catherine herself, though others saw her only as the rest of the Mantellate, wearing the black mantle and white habit of St. Dominic; when she clothed the Poor Pilgrim, He whom she had covered, coming again in glory, asked her if she recognized the garment she had given, and promised her instead a robe invisible to others, but visible and sensible to her alone, wherewith she should be clad till, in the presence of angels and saints, she would receive the garment of immortality. And, therefore, not only did she secretly wear the espousal ring ever after, but also that robe which had been drawn from the wounded side of her Redeemer and placed upon her with His own Hands, "a robe of sanguine colour, shining all about and yielding a marvellous beautiful light." Moreover, towards the close of her life she bore His Wounds unseen in her hands, and feet, and side, and the thorn-crown had been pressed upon her head by her own happy choice. But there are yet two of those amazing privileges upon which we would dwell in order to form some idea of the source of Catherine's supernatural power in her

public mission. Before the espousal she had been told to pray for the perfection of faith. Later, she was inspired to ask for the perfection of charity, and having obtained the promise that the Divine Will should be substituted for hers, there was given to her that unspeakable privilege to which her prayer had been the prelude, the replacing of her entire will and affection by those of her Spouse—the exchange of hearts which is too deep a mystery to fathom, but the story of which is told to every traveller to Siena, where in the lower part of the Dominican church a sacred spot is marked by a slab, bearing a heart and the brief inscription that here Catherine received the Heart of her Lord in exchange for her own. In her revelations the frequent mention of His wounded Side—whether she was raised up thither for comfort or drank therefrom the priceless reward of her superhuman self-conquest in tending the sick—amply indicates that she shared beforehand the devotion reserved for the latter days of coldness. But however much the exchange of hearts revealed to her of Christ or reveals to us of Catherine, perhaps there is nothing so marvellous as the manner in which she told the result of that favour. Well does our author say that in the soul of her who was regarded as a saint already, there must have been after that day a change as great as the transformation of an ordinary Christian into a saint. Yet she, the mystic Bride of Christ, saying to Him henceforth not I give Thee my heart, but “I give Thee Thy heart,” she who possessed the perfection of charity, and who had been suddenly raised to be conscious of no heart but the Heart of Jesus, could explain the change only by saying in broken words:—“Did you but know what I experience, surely if it could once be known there is no pride that would resist it. The fire of love which burns in my soul is so great, no earthly fire could compare with it, and it seems to renew in me the purity and simplicity of a little child, so that I feel as though I were no more than four years of age.” Yet another marvellous favour throws further light from Siena upon what Catherine was at Florence, and Pisa, and Lucca, Avignon and Rome. It is that mystery contained in the record, that realizing in prayer God’s love for man, her heart broke under the sudden strain of love, and she lay for four hours lifeless, and was mourned as dead. All at once, returning to life with a sigh, she wept ceaselessly for three days and three nights because she had seen heaven, purgatory, and hell, and having tasted the beatitude of the saints and believed her exile over, the Divine Will, the only will she knew, had sent her back to life, to warn the world of its iniquity, and travelling from city to city to win a great number of souls.

Hence her zeal, her life-long energy, and hence, in the beginning of her career, her untiring labours among the terrors of the plague at Siena.

For herself she was insensible either to fear or to the repugnances of nature. She had died and come to life again, and in whatever sense we understand that incident, she had come to regard this world as we also should regard it were we true to our profession of faith; as those could not fail to regard it to whom the last things and the eternal truths had by earnest meditation become realities. What were the chances of life or death, sickness or danger, to one who, as we may say, had seen eternity? What should they be to us who verily believe in it?

It was then with another heart than the heart of flesh, and with sight which had seen eternity, that she answered the command of our Lord, "Daughter, set thyself in readiness to go forth into the world."

Other supernatural favours of hers are beyond enumeration. Her voice in prayer became all-powerful, and her supernatural vision beheld the souls of those around her in life, as well as their state after death; and here it may be noted in proof of her perfect consistency, that her ready service in the burial of the dead arose from her joy in the death of the just. To her was given miraculous subsistence upon the Bread of Life; to her the companionship of Jesus, who spoke with her in her cell as a friend with a friend, or walked with her in the chapel Delle Volte, sharing in the recitation of her Office; and when the Bull of Canonization declares that her doctrine was "not acquired but infused," it is but little to add that she had been taught from heaven the worldly knowledge whereby she read the Office together with her Lord. To her, also, were given the long hours of rapture after communion, the miraculous communions, the life that might be called living in ecstasy. To her was said the sweet word of Providence: "Think of Me, and I will think of thee," and that still sweeter word, when realizing the favour shared by every child of the Church, she received from her Redeemer Himself absolution in the customary form, and felt for many days after the touch of the Divine Hand that had rested on her head in forgiveness. Yea, more, when others doubted her truth, her very face assumed the features of Him who abided within her. It was hers to wear a look which was called more angelic than human, and to diffuse from her touch or presence the perfume of sanctity; hers to pray for the virtue of the angels, until one of them visibly crowned her with a wreath of lilies of such beauty and fragrance that the mere recollection of that garland caused her a kind of rapture. And hers was the privilege of listening to the music of Paradise, at one time, when,

while standing at her window, the starlight of an Italian night rapt her into thoughts of the Eternal Uncreated Beauty, and suddenly there burst from the blue heavens the melody of angels; or at another time, when she heard vespers sung by the white multitude of virgins; or while yet she was conversing on earth, listened to the singing of saints and distinguished as if with mortal ear the voice of the Beloved Disciple and the "high sweet voice" of Mary Magdalen.

It needs instead of a few words a volume like that before us, to show that this ecstatic life rested on the same basis as that of the ordinary spiritual life, and that it would be erroneous to think it was lived under wholly different conditions. Not only are her steps of progress shown, but if we see her favoured beyond the rest, we see her also tried by storms of temptation and of calumny such as few could have survived or borne. We see the spotless spouse of Christ, the exalted ecstasica, lie prostrate upon the floor of her cell under the agony of prolonged temptation; we hear the life-long cry of her pure soul, "Peccavi, Domine, miserere mei!" Out of the whole history there strongly grows upon us the truth that Catherine Benincasa, rapt in ecstasy to see the beatitude of the saints, was still a child of Adam. And if, as it has been well said of the great Spanish Carmelitess, it may be that what is laid up for us hereafter was vouchsafed to her here, the kingdom of heaven which was in some sense all but hers on earth, was hers only by the heroic violence that bore it away. She was espoused to Christ forever in vision; but she had endured a pitiless domestic persecution and worked with sweet alacrity at the meanest drudgery to keep her childhood's vow. The one "*Cor Cordium*" was the heart of her life, but let it be remembered that she had sought expression for her love neither in household charities nor in almsdeeds alone; Him whom she loved she sought "in the streets and broad ways of her native city, and she found Him in the hospitals of the lepers, and wherever sickness had assumed its most terrible and repulsive forms;" and in each sufferer she tended the person of her Lord. If she heard the melody of saints she had spent in silence scarcely hearing a human voice three years from her entrance into the Order of Penance. If she lived on the Food of Angels her life had become by fasting and watching more angelic than human, her fasts being rigorous from childhood and her slumber only half an hour in two days, and that brief rest taken with her head on those steps of brick that are still shown under the window of the cell, or else lying on that bed of boards which her contemporaries constantly mention. And if in that narrow cell

there abided the perfume of Paradise stirring the careless to compunction by its very breath, there were also, as Father Thomas della Fonte, her first confessor, testified, the hidden instruments of penance, the discipline which afterwards looked "as if it had been steeped in blood for a long time and then dried."

But even her austerities no less than her privileges are on such a heroic scale that by their enumeration the woman is lost in the saint. Let us turn then to the pages of her history, out of which comes living from five centuries ago the likeness of her womanhood, not dazzling but humbly winning, not stoical but sympathetic and keenly sensitive, not triumphing with the aureole but often despised and insulted; and surrounded by a crowd of souls, religious and laymen, men and women, attracted not alone by her sanctity but by her sympathy, and uniting with the confiding reverence of disciples the docile familiarity of children. The simple domestic character of the mistress and mother stands out most clearly. Except when she was travelling or paying a visit of kindness or charity, the house of her parents was always her home. Her tastes were refined; had she not been a saint she would still have been a woman of genius; but her heart was essentially homely. The beauty of nature delighted her; flowers, which she wove in crosses and garlands, were a source of pleasure to her even during the three years of seclusion, and she who had been known to sing the unearthly song of ecstasy, recreated herself often with more earthly songs of her Beloved.

She was never idle; when not engaged in prayer or in works of charity for the souls and bodies of others, she was always to be found either reading or working. Burlamacchi bids us take notice of the thimble that was in the bag of eggs, mentioned in one of the anecdotes of her life, as a proof that she was accustomed to use her needle. But we know as much from other circumstances. She mended and patched the mantle of her clothing, and made the vessels and altar-linen of her chapel. In fact she was skilful in all a woman's best accomplishments; she could wash and cook, make bread, or tend the sick, with those same hands that were to be sealed with the mysterious stigmas.

There is indeed, special mention of an ecstasy when she was turning the spit; and though one of the simplest stories, not the least beautiful and heavenly of her life, is the story of the multiplied bread which the Blessed Virgin helped her to make. Nor did the saint, even in public ecstasy, appear as a seraph to the Sieneſe. If we want to see how human she was and how commonplace she looked, let us turn to the time when she was

charged with singularity and hypocrisy by the townspeople and even by some of her friends, because of her long abstinence from food and her frequent reception of the Blessed Eucharist. The jealousy of her sisters in the Third Order had so worked upon the Prior of San Dominico, that Catherine was even refused when she knelt at the altar rail, and on the rare occasions when she received communion, she was expected to finish her prayers quickly, a thing for her impossible because of the hours of ecstasy which invariably followed it.

Low and vulgar minds will regard even the sublimest mysteries from a low and vulgar point of view. We can fancy the old sacristan fidgeting about with his keys in his hand, unable to shut the church doors because Catherine Benincasa was so long at her prayers. That was the limit of his view of the subject, and he found many among his brethren whose comprehension of the matter did not rise to a higher level than his own. So at last, one day, losing patience, they took her, all in ecstasy as she was, and carrying her off in a rough and brutal manner, they flung her out on a heap of rubbish outside the church doors, which they then proceeded to lock behind her. There she lay, cast out as if she had been some vile reptile, with her senses the while all rapt in God. . . . And this happened not once, but often. . . . She possessed her soul in patience, and by patience she at last overcame. Surely in the sight of the angels this is the sublimest page in Catherine's life. To many it is given in a certain sense to taste of the sufferings of their Divine Master, but comparatively few enjoy the privilege of sharing His humiliation. Catherine in her ecstasy, flung out of the church by rude hands, and lying in the broad thoroughfare under the scorching sun; kicked and spat upon by brutal men and spiteful women; but unmoved in her patience, always calm, always sweet, always silent; what a spectacle is this! what a reflection of the ignominies of Jesus! And having reached that depth of profound abjection, can we wonder that she should soar upwards from it to the sublimest heights of charity?

Such were the trials of the woman Catherine Benincasa, and the vivid picture that we have cited is an example of the manner in which the human depths of her life and its ordinary aspect are brought before us. But there is more than this to complete the character of Catherine; she was not exempt from the common lot of weakness and suffering, but shared it to a more than common degree. It is true that her presence was especially joy-giving, that her countenance readily expressed a gracious gladness, and that her power of consolation for others was unbounded, but in her own body she bore a continual martyrdom day after day to life's end. She had accepted in his stead her father's purgatory, in the form of a pain which remained in her side until death. She was scarcely able to touch earthly food, and her incapacity for it caused continual

suffering. She had asked to share her Lord's Passion and as one of her disciples says, she was fastened to the cross all her life by threefold pain. Not only, then, are we to remember her invisible adornment by the Spouse, her glorious visions, her heroic austerities, her perfect simple womanhood; we are also to have before us when we think of the Catherine who was welcomed to Florence or who journeyed to Avignon, one who bore the exhausting burden of life-long pain. This sometimes forgotten fact is beautifully brought forward in a thoughtful passage which we are tempted to quote; it is descriptive of the portrait of the saint; two of these portraits are given in the volume, the first being the nearest approach possible to a likeness, but both agreeing in the chief points of feature and in the gentle bend of the head.

Gaze at it, dear reader, and bear in mind that she whom it represents was never for a moment free from a wearing bodily pain; you will detect in it something of the languor of suffering, and of that calm tranquillity which no provocation ever disturbed; but do not call it sad, for those eyes could have rested on you with unutterable tenderness, and those lips could always command a smile which carried joy and comfort into the hearts of those who beheld it. Raymond tells us that the beauty of Catherine was not excessive. But few persons when they think of the saints represent them as possessed of that kind of beauty which can be depicted by the brush or the chisel. We think of them with the light of faith beaming from their eyes, with purity on their smooth unruffled brows, and every feature sweetened by charity. We think of them as we think of our own mothers, who in the eyes and to the memory of their children are always beautiful; and sometimes we think of them as they were transfigured in moments of prayer and communion even before the eyes of men; a faint foreshadowing of that heavenly beauty which will rest on their countenances when we behold them standing in the eternal light.

Therefore, no matter how brilliant were her supernatural gifts, or how great her mission, St. Catherine stands forth from this history a lowly, or if we may use the word, a homely saint, and from these pages not only do we know her, but we become familiar with her in the strict sense of the word.

After the three years' silence of her cell, her mingling with the world was effected gradually, the intercourse with her family being extended by degrees to those beyond, while there gathered round her the circle of her "spiritual children." The first of these were her near relatives and some of the Mantellate; others came from the religious confraternity which held its meetings under the Hospital of Santa Maria della Scala which she frequented; others again were drawn to her from the higher ranks of Siena through her intercourse with the noblest

families, such as the Tolomei or the Salimbeni, for throughout the whole city whether from the days of revolution or the visitation of plague and famine, the name of Catherine was known, and high and low had recourse to her as the angel of peace, the exorcist of evil spirits, the healer of the sick, the virgin powerful in prayer. We leave to readers of the history, the tracing of the lives of her companions. Her life-story was never told until theirs were interwoven with it: and we may well believe of all of them that in eternity they are not divided, but find the immortality of that holy love for God, and in God, which bound them together on earth; for although alas! it is true that an unnamed one fell away, there was for the rest the magnificent promise that not one of those who had been given to her should perish. First among them we must number her sister-in-law Lisa, and the young widow Alexia, and others of the Sisters of Penance such as Cecca di Gori and Giovanna Pazzi, or as she was named in jest, for their very jests are kept for us, Giovanna pazza. Then, turning to the brothers, we find her confessors, who were spiritual sons as well as guiding fathers—F. Thomas della Fonte, the holy but unlearned, F. Bartholomew Dominic with his graphic written portraits of her, F. Raymund of Capua who was to unite the notes of F. Thomas della Fonte and his own to form the basis of the Life or "Legend," by which the world knows most of her. There was Fra Santi, too, holy in name and life, who found "the precious pearl of the gospel, our blessed Catherine," and learned more from her discourse than from years in his hermitage. There was Father John Tantucci another hermit, a "great learned Doctor," whose studies had begun at our own Cambridge; he, who came to disprove her sanctity, and generously acknowledging himself conquered left his hermitage, and followed the holy virgin henceforth in all her journeys, and, as Malevolti says, "he was one of the three confessors deputed by the See Apostolic to hear the confessions of those who by means of the said Holy Virgin, should be brought to salutary penance." And there was Father William Flete, the English hermit, who did his part during the schism in keeping England faithful to the line of Peter, and who as one of her most attached disciples was wont to say that the Pope himself might think it an honour to be her spiritual son. And amongst men of the world there was the chivalrous Gabriel Piccolomini, planning with her another crusade; Ser Christofano di Gano the notary, without a vestige of romance, poetry or humour, but with "the fidelity and plodding perseverance of a terrier dog;" Francesco Malevolti, the rich young nobleman, brilliant and unstable but persevering even to a final victory of self-annihilation when after the saint's death

there came upon him the yoke she had promised, in the form of admission among the Carthusians. Nor were there wanting the poet and the painter, among a band of fourteenth-century Italians. We get a glimpse here of her portrait by her disciple, Andrea, one of the artist family of the Vanni; and Anastagio di Monte Altimo and the knightly poet Jacomo del Pecora both celebrated her virtues in verse. Another poet, and one of the most interesting figures of the whole group, was the refined, melancholy, tender-hearted Neri di Landoccio, who ended his days in a hermitage after having been supported by Catherine in his life-long trial of want of hope and courage. The very opposite to his gentle despondent nature was that of Stephen Maconi, with his dashing vivacity and boyish brightness—all gone in a moment, when Catherine the mother was gone and he could only haunt her tomb. Nor must we forget Master Matheu, the rector of the Casa della *Misericordia* with whom Stephen Maconi had the hearty laugh reported in one of his letters. There was also Matthew Tolomei, the son of one of the noblest families of Siena; and many more named incidentally. But even a list of reference would be incomplete without mentioning the third secretary, who with Stephen Maconi and Neri shared the labours of the pen at Catherine's dictation; this was Barduccio Canigiani, worthy to be at her side supporting her in the hour of supreme agony and ecstasy in Rome, and worthy because of his angelic life, to be chosen as another beloved disciple, her "dear son Barduccio." We can only enumerate the chief among this family of benediction; in the history their individuality is strongly preserved and depicted with an admirable insight into character.

But her sphere of charity was never limited to the circle of disciples. Her fame spread from city to city, and every form of need or misery had a claim upon her heart. She was well-known at the place of public execution, the Giustizia, whither she accompanied the last journey and comforted the last moments of many a criminal, and of many another, too, who led astray in the restless revolutions of the time had been condemned for but little cause, and like the Pellico of a later age had accepted human justice as Divine mercy and found therein "la via del cielo, sotto il pese della croce." Nor was the great heart of the saint without its share in her master's zeal for souls. Her attraction of predilection was towards sinners, whom "her beautiful soul, stainless as the driven snow," sought out and rescued, saving, as it is related, thousands and tens of thousands.

Studying the characteristics of her sanctity, we perceive in her youthful perfection what one of our own poets saw in the

experience of age—a being made of many beings. She seems to have shown not one form of sanctity and active charity, but the united forms of many saints. But what shall we say of the unique mission which she was next called upon to fulfil, and which she did fulfil with an energy, a foresight, a manifold readiness and a simple ease of act and speech which showed her as much a consummate diplomatist as a simple saint. She advanced into the public life of her time, called thither by the renown of her sanctity, coming forward always with the reluctance of womanhood, but carried on with the force of a destiny; and throughout the time of her embassies and her intercourse with the Pope and the civil powers, her supernatural favours did not lessen nor her spiritual life change; visions and raptures, austerities, active charity, thirst to save sinners—all went on unchanged from the Tuscan cities to Avignon, from Avignon to Rome. Her union with the Spouse “was not weakened or obscured in after years by her converse with the world; but when outwardly speaking with men, her heart was always inwardly engaged with God, and in this lay the secret of that marvellous power which she exercised over all who approached her.” Her life was at once contemplative and active, hidden and public.

It was the time of Guelph and Ghibeline factions. When the Republican cities of Italy were torn by frequent insurrection, and the country ravaged by Free Companies such as those of a Duke Werner, a Fra Moreale, or a Sir John Hawkwood, who, when they were unemployed as mercenary troops, were little better than armies of brigands. Partly driven from the city of Peter by its tempests of revolution, partly led by the ambition of Philip le Bel, the Papal Court had been fixed at Avignon since 1305, and Rome was left to the bloodshed of party strife, and to consequent abandonment. In 1367, when Urban V. had returned to the Holy City, and gone back disheartened to France, he had found, as contemporary writers tell us, the churches and basilicas dilapidated, grass growing in the thoroughfares, heaps of rubbish and forsaken barricades encumbering the streets. Ten years after, in the time of Pope Gregory, it could have been but little altered, but its desolation was only a shadow of the spiritual desolation of the Church when the exile of Avignon had become changed into the splendour of a worldly Court, the religious orders relaxed, the Sacred College a clique of French courtiers, and the central example encouraging everywhere a splendour of ease and luxury that deadened the ecclesiastical character. Gregory XI. saw the evil, and knew the one remedy lay in a return to the Seven-Hills, but true-hearted Pontiff though he was, his mild irresolution stood

in the way of his wisdom. Too often misgoverned by his legates, the States of the Church were soon on fire with the spirit of revolution, and, led by Florence, no less than eighty minor cities revolted from his suzerainty; Florence, Papal and Guelph as it had been, was at the instigation of the Ghibeline Ricci and the senseless leaders of the "popolani," at open war with the Pope and lying under interdict; while its own government, divided between the contending Eight of War and the Guelph Captains, and shared among committees of magistrates, was, as it is aptly remarked, "a system which seemed to have been devised with the express view of promoting factions and misunderstandings." It was at this time of lawlessness and disaster, and during the course of this blood-stained revolt of the Florentines and the minor cities, that the holy fame of a virgin of Siena having long been whispered through the land, men of high rank from all parts, lay and ecclesiastic, began to have recourse to her for advice by letter, or to ask her assistance on a larger scale in her well-known work of negotiating peace; and thus, as it is expressly stated and amply proved, Catherine Benincasa, the simple tradesman's daughter, was "unavoidably" drawn into the current of public affairs. It was her task to hold back the sister cities of Pisa and Lucca and her own beloved Siena from joining in the revolt, and though they fell into ill-fame by holding intercourse with the greater Republic, and shared to some extent the ban of the interdict, it was largely owing to this one woman's tact and unremitting labour that they had the firmness to resist taking an open share in the crime of the Florentine war—a public crime which, however much provoked by individual mismanagement, had the nature of a parricidal act as well as of a sacrilege. It was in this light that Catherine saw the prolonged breaking away of the Republic of Florence from the Holy See, and her heart was torn, recognizing in it the rebellion of children against a Father, and the ruin of souls. Therefore, while on the one hand she urged entire submission, although she well knew how much reason there was for discontent, on the other she implored a speedy forgiveness and peace at any cost. Before the breaking out of these troubles, she was already in communication with the Pope, for with that enthusiasm which is the dower of all generous natures, she had taken up the idea of drawing the Christian States together for a new crusade; and this was also a cherished hope with Gregory. To bring back the Pope to Rome, and thereby plant in the midst of the Church the new example of a Papal Court with the austere dignity of an ecclesiastical centre of labour, instead of the splendid worldliness of Avignon; to exterminate the feuds of Italian factions by the union of Christendom in a

holy war, and not even to leave the enemies of the Church beyond the universal blessing but to make the conquered infidels "sharers in the Passion and Blood of the Immaculate Lamb"—these were the objects of her longing desire; the desire that was ever in her heart, finding expression by such words as the imploring message: "I am dying of desire and expectation; have pity on me, and beg the Christ on earth not to delay." The hope of a crusade having formed common ground for correspondence with Pope Gregory, before she had begun sending him envoys and letters with the object of effecting peace in Italy; and her personal presence having been of power already in some of the minor cities, the wisest of the Florentines considering her talent for negotiation and her correspondence with the Pope, invited her to their city, in 1376, to be the peacemaker between the great Republic and the Holy See. Already Count Robert of Geneva (destined to be the future anti-Pope Clement VII.) was leading into Italy the Papal army; and the Florence of the interdict was a scene of tumult and spiritual desolation, stained as it was with the slaughter of the Inquisitors and the Nuncio, and with the blood of rival factions. It is something amazing that in the midst of such a confusion of hostility and passion, Catherine Benincasa should have gained a hearing, and gained it despite the whole weight of the powerful Ricci family thrown against her. She made many friends there among high and low, one of them being the father of the future disciple, her dear son Barduccio; and finally, the best members of the Government sincerely, and the rest with at least a show of sincerity, besought her to save the city from destruction by pleading their cause at Avignon with the Sovereign Pontiff. She had already written to Gregory XI. praying for peace and using a familiarity of advice, which not only tells how cordial were her relations with him, but almost betokens the authority flowing from inward consciousness of a divine mission. She had addressed him as her "Dearest Father," conjuring him, in the name of Christ crucified, to come back to Rome, not to be discouraged by news of scandals and revolts, not to be dissuaded by those who would hinder him:—

Be generous and fearless. Respond to the call of God, who bids you return to the city of St. Peter, our glorious Head, whose successor you are; come and live there, and then raise the standard of the Holy Cross. This will deliver us from our wars, and divisions, and iniquities, and will at the same time convert the infidels from their errors. Then you will give good pastors to the Church, and restore her strength, for those who have hitherto devoured her have drained her of her life blood, so that her face is become quite pale. Do not

stay away because of what has happened at Bologna. I assure you the savage wolves are ready to lay their heads on your bosom like so many gentle lambs, and to ask mercy of you, as of their father. I conjure you, then, listen favourably to what F. Raymund and my other sons will say to you; they come to you on the part of Jesus crucified and are faithful children of Holy Church.

But now the written words were to be changed for word of mouth. She was the ambassador of Florence to Avignon; and to the Holy Father she sent beforehand a message, which in our own days has been unconsciously echoed in many a heart far from saintship but true to filial loyalty: "Tell the Christ on earth, that when I have seen him I shall sing my *Nunc dimittis*."

She saw him in the June of the same year, and her presence coming with simplicity but authority into the midst of the courtiers of Avignon caused not only wonder and objection, but in some cases persecution. Raymund of Capua says the whole Court at first rose up against her, but soon there was in all minds a wonderful change, and those who had opposed her most became her benefactors. The favour she found with Gregory is best told in the words of the same witness:—

The Holy Father, in my presence and by my mouth, committed the treaty of peace to Catherine's decision, saying to her: "In order to show you that I sincerely desire peace, I commit the entire negotiation into your hands; only be careful of the honour of the Church."

The result of this full commission of power into her hands would have been entire and immediate peace for the Italian Republics, but for the bad faith of the Florentines themselves. Her arrival at Avignon was to have been followed by the coming of ambassadors empowered to make full submission as a formal prelude to the treaty. But the ambassadors, when after long delay they came, were of the more intractable faction, and their replies to her reveal how mortifying and humiliating was the mission which to our eyes is apt to appear an exaltation rather than what it really was, a laborious and patient and in some degree a thankless undertaking. They curtly refused to treat with her, and when she reminded them of the pledge of submission given by them at Florence, they answered with insolence, refusing to settle the affairs of the Republic with anyone but the Pope. As a necessary consequence, the negotiations fell to the ground. But while she failed in one object through the fault of others, Providence had destined for her journey a far different end; and the grand success she gained was the return of the line of Pontiffs to their own city of Rome after seventy years of ruinous exile. In her personal intercourse with Gregory she forcibly urged upon

him the necessity of the return; but feeling bound under the yoke of the French Court and its Cardinals, and suffering keenly in his gentle nature from the appeals of his near relatives, he had not the strength of mind necessary to carry out his resolution. It was reserved for Catherine to gain the victory, and when she had proved the weight of her advice by revealing to him his own vow to return, a vow made long ago in secret, he was convinced; but he still felt the need of her fortitude, and besought her to remain with him up to the last moment, leaving Avignon only on the day of his own departure. She gladly stayed, gave her advice that preparations should be made secretly, inspired him with confidence for the final trial; and on the 13th of September 1376, while the courtiers refused to believe in the possibility of his actual departure, Gregory left Avignon for ever, achieving a triumph wholly supernatural, since he whose natural tenderness had so long held him captive, stepped forth from the palace doors unmindful of his own father's prostrate appeal. Rome, blazing with illumination, and with thronged streets, received him, as Peter D'Amely says, "with delirious joy;" while she who had been chiefly instrumental in the restoration was once more far from the luxurious French city, and as far from the praises of the world, hidden at Siena in her poor cell at the old Fullonica. But not only had she accomplished that life-giving change; she had won during the journey a harvest of souls, especially at Genoa, where, also, according to Caffarini, she had held discourse with many learned doctors and masters in theology who came to speak with her. Nor had her old project of a crusade been forgotten; and it was not till long after her labours by word and pen at Avignon, that the idea had to be given up, partly because of the feuds of the Italian cities, and partly because of such divisions of Christendom as the long wars between England and France. With regard to the hereditary contest in which England was involved, it may be of interest to note here that the successive Popes, Frenchmen though they were for half a century, and the saint of Siena herself, took a warm interest in negotiations for a peace favourable to England; and there is here a letter from Catherine to Charles the Wise entreating him to forego the question of rival claims and make peace for the sake of souls; still more, while she was at Avignon, the Duke of Anjou, to whom she had written engaging his services for a crusade, besought her to go to Paris and give her assistance in effecting a treaty of peace with the English. It was not only with the royal house of France that the "popolana" of Siena was drawn into correspondence. We find also her letters to the

tyrant Bernabo of Milan, the dread of northern Italy and the scourge of his people: and even his respect she commanded, so that his vain Queen, Beatrice, paid courtesy to the dyer's daughter to win her powerful friendship. To the Queen-mother of Hungary she also wrote in order that her son might be induced to take up arms for the Cross; and (not to mention many others) we have already alluded to a letter of hers at a later date, undoubtedly sent to Richard II. of England, or rather to his advisers, for at the beginning of the schism he was but a boy. There is one more whose name cannot be omitted. Among all Catherine's correspondents one of the most remarkable, because of her singular interest in that unhappy woman, is Queen Joanna of Naples, of dark and tragic renown. Catherine's first letter to her won a promise of co-operation in the expected crusade, a valuable promise, because she who was by a curious title the "Queen of Jerusalem," had command of the Southern Mediterranean, and would make of the Neapolitan kingdom an armed power halfway between the Western countries and the shores of Palestine. But in later years when the schism rent the Church, Joanna, who had been fast acquiring her historical evil name, belied all hopes by first joining the anti-Pope, and then feigning repentance to gain her own ends. There was a time when Catherine was on the verge of visiting her Court; she was reluctantly dissuaded from it, but she never gave up her interest in the unhappy Queen, and even when Joanna was excommunicated for having become a source of public danger through her treachery to the Holy See, it was not until Catherine's influence had long delayed the sentence. Two years after the death of Catherine Benincasa, the wretched Joanna met with her violent death in the *Castello dell' Uovo* in revenge of her crimes. The confronting of two such characters as the seraphic virgin and the ill-famed Queen of Naples, forms one of those episodes of history which fiction could not have invented, and which criticism does not dare to weigh.

After the restoration of the Sovereign Pontiff to Rome, Catherine's next great embassy was to Florence, whither she went at his desire early in 1378. It was then she delivered her three orations before the magistrates of the Republic assembled in the *Palazzo Vecchio*, and with such success that the interdict, which had been braved and broken by the Government and people, was once more accepted and obeyed. But though during her visit to the city she was again an angel of peace in reconciling the Guelph and Ghibeline partisans, there came a day when, in the outbreak known as the *insurrección* of the *Ammoniti*, her life was in actual danger,

Her advice to the Guelph Captains had been abused, till by lack of prudence they roused a popular tumult; and the ruffians of the city, charging her with the banishment of Ghibelines, sought her life, and would have shed the holy virgin's blood, had she not been delivered by a special Providence from the infuriated mob. She had thirsted in her heart for martyrdom, and kneeling, declared herself willing to suffer for God and for the Church, if only they would let her companions go unharmed. The murderous crowd withdrew in confusion, and she was left untouched, grieving for the lost chance of a swift passage to her Spouse, and still pleading as tenderly as ever for the peace of the city with the Holy See. The treaty was at length signed in July, 1738, and ratified at Rome in the following October. Catherine had refused to leave the city where her life had been in peril, until she saw granted the object of her prayers and labours. It was only after the treaty had been positively signed at Florence, that she acceded to the desire of her followers to place herself in the safety and tranquillity of Siena.

"By the grace of my Saviour Jesus Christ," she said, "I have followed His commands and those of His Vicar; those whom I found revolted against the Church I leave subject to that sweet and tender mother. Now, therefore, let us return to Siena."

Once again in her native city, she applied herself diligently to the composition of the celebrated Dialogue, the work that places Catherine of Siena among the few sainted women who have added to the treasures of mystical theology, associating her name in after ages with those of another Catherine, the exponent of the doctrine of purgatory, or of a Theresa who by singular concession has been ranked with the doctors of the Church.

The third and last part of the history opens with a concise narrative of the breaking out of the Great Schism of the West, when in the autumn of 1378 the French Cardinals, the great majority of the Sacred College, disputing the election of Gregory's successor, Urban VI., met at Agnagni, and elected the anti-Pope, the warlike Cardinal-Count of Geneva, who assumed the title of Clement VII. and drew away with him in mistaken allegiance France, the leader of Western Christendom, Spain, Scotland, and the treacherous Joanna's kingdom of Naples. England and a large part of Germany, the nobly Christian Hungary and the mountain-bound Bohemia, were foremost among the faithful lands; and that they were faithful is largely to be attributed to the prayers and letters of the humble daughter of St Dominic, who towards the end of that

year was summoned to Rome by Urban to be his counsellor in his hour of need and abandonment.

Like all her other saintly judgments, her horror of the schism took its force from her perfection of faith. At the first news of discord, she wrote to the Italian Cardinals, that the fear of ultimate heresy caused her inexpressible pain, and therefore she conjured them by the Precious Blood of redemption not to separate from the Head. "Alas, what misery! all the rest seems but a straw, a mere shadow, compared to the danger of schism." But the schism was already an existing fact, when for the first time she entered Rome to stand by the Holy Father, gently restraining his too stern temperament, and supporting him by her gift of counsel. If her letters to the Queen of Naples, to the Cardinals, and the powerful Count of Fondi, ended in failure; her energetic action was crowned with success, when she wrote to the magistrates of Florence, Bologna, Perugia, Venice, and her own Siena, to hold back those cities from joining in what her faith and ardour called the work of incarnate demons. The early months of 1379 were spent by her in incessant labour, now setting forth by letter, with clear precision, the arguments proving the validity of Urban's election; now foreseeing inevitable war after the bloodshed caused by the schismatic attack on Rome, and exhorting the commanders of Urban's forces, Count Alberic or the Englishman Hawkwood, to confide in the prayers that would be offered for the success of their arms; but throughout all her active occupation she was still the prayerful contemplative, treading with reverence from shrine to shrine of the city of martyrs, and dwelling within the circle of her spiritual family, some twenty-five of whom had come with her to Rome, their one home being supported only by the alms sent by Providence. At the close of April, the schismatic army of Free Lances having been broken at Marino by Alberic, and the Castle of St. Angelo unconditionally surrendered to Urban, Catherine advised a public procession of thanksgiving, in order to turn the exultation of the Romans into renewed devotion to their Pontiff; and, at her word, Urban walked bare footed from Sta-Maria in Trastevere to St Peter's, surrounded by a vast concourse of his clergy and people. But the following year, 1380, had hardly opened, when the work of treacherous hands became manifest among the Romans, and the life of Urban was in danger from his own subjects. Catherine in vain counselled conciliation instead of the exercise of a just but imprudently severe authority; the people rose in insurrection; and in vision the holy virgin saw the city filled with demons exciting them to parricide. Maimbourg, in his adverse history of the schism,

says that at this time an attempt was made to poison the Pope and that the mob attacked the Vatican, but were overawed by the appearance of Urban confronting them in his Pontifical vestments. He also states that Catherine quelled the popular tumults by open remonstrance, as well as by her prayers. But even if she interfered in person, it was certainly her secret prayer that conquered, for, from the moment when she heard of the threats of the citizens, she began to beseech God not to permit such a crime, and for the peace and unity of the Holy See she was offering the sublimest prayer of the creature, that of self-oblation :—

O Lord (she exclaimed), if Thy Justice must needs be satisfied, inflict on my body the chastisement which this people deserves ; for the honour of Thy Name and of the Holy Church, I will cheerfully drain the chalice of suffering and death.

No sooner was the prayer made, than she felt that it was answered. From that day the disturbances in the city calmed down, but at the same time, as Raymund says in the Legend, her sufferings daily became greater, she wasted away till the skin seemed to adhere to the bone, and she was as a phantom of her former self. On Sexagesima Sunday her sufferings increased to a frightful violence.

It appears that whilst still in the Church of St. Peter's, a mysterious vision or sign of her approaching death and of its cause was granted to her. She not only saw but felt the Navicella, or Ship of the Church, laid on her shoulders. Crushed by the awful weight, she sank fainting to the ground ; she understood that she was in some way to give her life for the Church, as a true victim, and from that moment her bodily strength began visibly to consume away. This remarkable incident was followed on her return home by an attack or crisis of supernatural suffering.

As she herself declared, the evil spirits were furious against her, and terror was joined to her other pains. The supreme crisis is told by herself with an inimitable power of suggesting the indescribable by human language. On the following day she had left her cell to go to the chapel in her house, leaning on her son Barduccio, when the fury of the demons threw her to the ground.

" And lying on the ground it seemed as if my soul quitted the body ; not in the same way as it did that other time, because *then* I tasted the joy of the blessed, enjoying with them the Sovereign Good ; but now it seemed to me that I was a thing apart. I did not seem to be in my body, but I beheld my body as though it had belonged to some other person ; and my soul, seeing the distress of him who was with me, (*i.e.*, Barduccio), wished to know if I could use my body so as to be able to say to him : ' My Son, be not afraid.' But I found I could

not move my tongue nor any other member, any more than if my body had been utterly without life. So I left my body as it was, and fixed my understanding on the abyss of the Holy Trinity."

After narrating her communing with God, her offering of the Blood of the Lamb, and the respite of comfort that followed, her subsequent description continues:—

"Then my body began to breathe a little, showing that the soul had returned to it. I was full of wonder, and there remained such a pain in my heart, that I still feel it. Then all joy, all consolation, and all strength seemed taken from me, and being carried into the room above, it seemed to me full of demons who began a fresh attack, the most terrible I ever sustained; for they sought to make me believe that it was not I that was in my body, but an unclean spirit. But I invoked the Divine Help with the utmost tenderness, refusing no suffering, but repeating, *Deus in adjutorium meum intende, Domine ad adjuvandum me festina!*"

Where is the recorded martyrdom that surpasses the intensity of anguish shadowed forth in these words of the virgin spouse of Christ? And for two days and nights such conflicts lasted, while her disciples mourned her as dead. The marvels of her last sufferings, which seemed to reach both physically and spiritually the verge of human endurance, can only be told by her own letter to Raymund of Capua; but there is one revelation too wonderful to be omitted—the violent taking of her heart by the Eternal God, that its life-blood might be pressed out over His Church, in answer to her prayer: "O Eternal God, accept the sacrifice of my life for the mystical body of Thy holy Church; I have nothing to give save that which Thou hast given to me; take my heart then, and press it out over the face of Thy Spouse!" It was no wonder, then, that when lying on her bed of boards she bade farewell to her son and father, Bartholomew Dominic, Prior of San Domenico, she should have assured him that she desired of God to expiate in person the sins of the schism, and that, should her life end, the cause of her death was the zeal with which she was consumed for the holy Church. So died five hundred years ago, with the triple crown of the virgin, the teacher of truth, and the martyr for the See of Rome, the Spouse of Christ, Catherine of Siena. And we leave to those who follow the pages of her history the privilege of all but witnessing, by means of graphic and detailed narrative, the closing scene of the saint's life, when, calling humbly for pardon and for "the Blood," she went forth from the circle of her weeping children and her own sorrowing mother, to meet the Spouse of her childhood's vow.

From five centuries ago her death as well as her life comes before us in her history as vividly as many a scene of actual

experience in the nineteenth-century world. Well is it said that, in contemplating her and her companions, time vanishes "like the needle's point;" and while we view familiarly the saintly character, we have the advantage over her contemporaries in at least one sense, for we are able to look upon its objects and its effects as a whole. We can see that it was through the simplicity of life and aim engendered of her perfection of faith, that the weak untaught woman of a little Tuscan city became the peace-maker of the Italian Republics and the adviser of kings; and the force of consistent faith and act even in the material world, is surely the legend written across her life in letters so bold that "all who run may read." But the Saint of Siena was also the Saint of Rome; and, glancing at her career as a whole, we perceive what one might venture to call in a high sense the ruling passion of her life and death, in devotion to the person of the Vicar of Christ—the outcome necessarily of her stupendous strength of faith. It is impossible to imagine how much she actually effected for the unity of the Church, not only by her prayers and sacrifice for healing the schism of the West, but still earlier by her instrumentality in restoring the seat of the Papacy to Rome. For nearly forty years the seamless garment of Christ was rent after the restoration; but who can compute how long the scandal of the anti-Popes might have been prolonged, had a disputed election taken place at the Court of Avignon, where the influence of the schismatical party in France might have supported interminably, on ground consecrated in the popular eyes by the tradition of more than half-a-century, a Pope of Avignon against a Pope of Rome. It was a contingency which Catherine's prophetic clearness of sight may well have dreaded. But this is surmise, not history; the historical facts remain that Catherine Benincasa was foremost in effecting the longed-for return from the captivity of Avignon, and that this inestimable service to the Holy See was crowned by the voluntary offering of her life for the welfare of the Church. May she who saw Christ in His Vicar, and was led thereby to such royal-hearted devotion to the See of Rome, strengthen in these days the loyalty that centres in the successor of Peter, of Gregory, and of Urban, and inspire a fresh enthusiasm for the Rome of captivity and humiliation.

ART. VII.—THE SUPPRESSION OF THE CONGREGATIONS IN FRANCE.

1. *Les Congrégations Religieuses en France ; leurs Œuvres et leurs Services : avec une Introduction.* Par EMILE KELLER, Député. Paris : Poussielgue Frères. 1880.
2. *Les Décrets du 29 Mars, 1880, sur les Congrégations non-autorisées.* Etudes rétrospectives sur les Consultations de MM. H. de VATIMESNIL et BERRYER, &c. Paris : Durand et Pedone-Lauriel. 1880.
3. *L'Expulsion des Jésuites, et des autres Religieux au nom des Lois Existantes.* Par ANTONIN LERAC. Paris : Librairie de la Société Bibliographique. 1880.
4. *Enseignement Secondaire Congréganiste.* 3^{ème} ed. Paris : Lecoffre. 1879.
5. *Les Erreurs de M. Spuller.* 3^{ème} ed. Paris : Lecoffre. 1879.

ON the 15th of March, the famous "Article 7" of M. Ferry's Education Bill was rejected by the Senate of the French Parliament by a majority of 18 in a house of 282. At the last moment, and when M. Eugène Pelletan had made a final effort to carry the Government proposal by once more bringing forward the original Clause in the shape of an amendment to the Report of the Committee—at the moment when the vote was about to be taken, M. Freycinet, the President of the Council of Ministers, ascended the tribune and made the following declaration :

Gentlemen :—I have but a single word to say to the Senate. At the end of the first discussion M. Dufaure made an appeal to the Government which we could not leave without a reply. M. Dufaure expressed his hope that, before the discussion was resumed, the Government would be able to find a compromise (*transaction*) by means of which an agreement might be arrived at. Notwithstanding that appeal, and in spite of our respect for the illustrious man from whom it came, we did not propose any fresh form of words, because we really believed that Article 7 was itself a compromise. (Approval from the Left.) That compromise has been rejected, and we cannot see any other solution than to *put in force existing laws* ; and the Government has no choice but to accept the situation in which it finds itself placed by the vote of the Senate. (Applause from the Left. Excitement on the Right.)

These words were the first sounds of that persecution which

was to be begun in a few days with all the formality of Presidential decrees. At the moment, they produced on the Senate no effect whatever, and the amendment was rejected with virtually the same majority with which the Report of the Committee had been carried.

The defeat of the Government project for taking the education of France out of the hands of the "congregations," roused the whole revolutionary party to fury. The "opportunists" (that is, M. Gambetta's intimate circle, who are quietly arranging the future of France) for once broke out into a noisy rage, hardly surpassed by the demonstrations of the Extreme Left themselves. Jules Simon and Dufaure, staunch republicans as they had proved themselves, were abused as violently as the Catholic Chesnelong and Lucien Brun. Since legislation had failed, executive measures must take its place. The "congregations" must be proscribed, if they could not be tied up. The Jesuits, above all, must be dealt with speedily and summarily; the Senate had refused to banish them from the ranks of French teachers; the Government must simply banish them from France itself. Acts of Parliament, it was discovered, were quite unnecessary; there were old laws still in force, shreds and tags of disreputable "decrees" owning all sorts of different authors—Bourbon kings, revolutionary tyrants, dictators, constitutional monarchs—that could be patched together for so good a purpose. M. Gambetta's organ, the *République Française*, frankly declared on March 16th that troubles were about to begin:—

Yesterday's vote seriously changes the situation. For ourselves, we must get ready once more for war. As for the Government—it must assume at once that new attitude, that attitude of firmness and of energy, rendered necessary by the vote of the friends of Simon and Dufaure. For we have the Government still, we Republicans of the Left. The eighteen voices of the Senate do not shake the Government; they strengthen it. Neither the Cabinet, nor the President, who has so boldly pledged himself to action, nor M. Ferry, who has become the bearer of a flag, has lost one particle of authority or of power. The Chamber will soon give them a renewed lease and the plainest directions what to do. . . . No legislation is required. An administrative ordinance is enough; and the administration depends on the Cabinet, and the Cabinet on the Chamber.

The Ferry Bill was bad enough, even without Article 7. It suppressed the admission of Catholic authorities on the Examining Boards of the University; it prohibited all denominational (or "free") establishments from assuming the title of "University," and it decreed that no fees could be charged for the admission of members to any establishment of superior education—thus ruinously handicapping the Catholic Universities in their com-

petition with the highly-paid State faculties. The Chamber of Deputies wanted more; but this was something, and they accepted it. What made them perhaps more readily acquiesce in the amendment of the Senate, was the reflection—distinctly put on record by the Government in the preamble of the measure, even before M. Freycinet's declaration quoted above—that it was not intended, even if Article 7 had been passed, that any existing powers in regard to the Congregations should thereby be rendered inoperative. The wavering fringe of the Republican party caught at this. There was no doubt that Article 7 had made a most violent stir in the country; it would be as well to make sure of the main provisions of the Bill, and throw on the Government the burden of making good—at some future time—the words it had, perhaps somewhat incautiously, uttered.

The Left did not lose a moment in showing they were determined to make the Government act. Devés, Philippoteaux, Spuller, and others, asked M. Freycinet, the very next day, what he meant to do. "We want," said Devés, "a plain declaration (*manifestation nette*) which may reassure the country and put an end to its fears." Some member of the Right here called out, "It is the Republic that the country fears, and no wonder." Then the Prime Minister stood up once more and said:

Gentlemen:—The Government has nothing to add to what it had occasion to say yesterday. The Government declared, and I now repeat; We shall enforce the laws; we shall enforce them on our own responsibility, and under the full sense of the great and manifold interests which are entrusted to us, and for which we must each day account to you. We reserve to ourselves complete liberty of action; we shall always be ready to answer to you for the way in which we use that liberty; and, in this delicate task now before us, a task which requires both prudence and firmness, we ask you to strengthen our hands by the expression of your confidence. (Loud applause from the Centre and the Left.)

The debate which ensued after this so clearly shows the temper of the persecuting party, and is so thoroughly characteristic of a French Chamber, that a few extracts will be both useful and interesting. The Ministerial declaration was accepted at once by both sides as a pledge that the Government was going to expel the Jesuits. The first speaker was M. de la Bassetière, the well-known Catholic orator of La Vendée. His principal point was that the Government had no legal power to expel any "religious" whatever. He reminded the Senate that the point of the legal existence of the Jesuits had been raised in the most formal and precise way in the discussions which preceded the passing of the Falloux Education Act of

1850, and that the amendment which denied that legal right had been opposed by Thiers, Cousin, Dupanloup, and Falloux himself, and registered by the Assembly. Were they going to bring down on themselves the crushing sarcasm of Père de Ravignan? "The name of Jesuit is one that hate is glad to get hold of; it is a name which makes justice superfluous."* In the name of law and liberty they must have the courage to give the Jesuits fair play.

Thereupon rushed to the tribune M. Madier de Montjau, a deeply-dyed republican, and his speech, though it is not pleasant reading, so well brings before an English public the furious injustice which possesses the dominant party in France that they will be thankful to have a rather long extract from it. "Who talks of law," he shrieked out, almost before he got to the top of the steps; "who talks of law, when he is talking of those whose very existence is a flagrant and permanent violation of the law?" He continued, amid the applause of the Left:

Gentlemen:—The situation of France is at this moment extremely grave; I am not exaggerating; I say it is grave in an unparalleled degree. Men whom France never sees at work except for her degradation and her ruin—men for whose benefit a lying legend of heroism has been invented which they have never deserved—men whose footsteps are found wherever oppression and suffering are found, and whom I follow through history by the bloody track they have made, from the sixteenth century, which gave them birth, down to 1815, when they filled our southern provinces with rapine and murder—(Prolonged applause from the Left and Centre) those disastrous and hateful men, those men whom we cannot but fear, because they consider all means good which will compass their ends, because they make a complete surrender of their will, that is, of their conscience, so as to have, at the service of crime, both the unity of action of an individual and the collective power of an association; these men, twenty times condemned and branded before all the world and before this nation, not only by the national instinct, but by the laws and the law courts—here, I say, lies the seriousness of the situation—these men, under the eyes of a nation which breathes the breath of Rabelais, and lives by the spirit of Voltaire, of a people who may not know all that we know, but which hates these brigands by instinct, and feels the danger of their existence; yes, before the very eyes of this country and this nation, these men, twenty times condemned, twenty times driven out, have not only kept themselves above the national will, and above the law, but they have struck their roots in our generous soil, without laying down one of their own weapons; they have thriven and grown, and taken up strong positions everywhere as if the country belonged to

* Ce nom, il est heureux pour la haine; il dispense de la justice.

them; like the hideous *pieuvre*, they have stretched out deadly arms on all sides to strangle their country, sucking out its money, its intellect, and its conscience! (Cheering from the Left and the Centre.) We have never had a Government yet which could understand the scandal and the sin of allowing this to go on—or which has dared to be the Hercules to deliver the country from this monster. Will you be the one? Or must we seek him elsewhere? Do you feel yourselves big enough and strong enough to crush the thing which hitherto no one has dared to touch? I want an answer. I stand here to ask you if you have this firm determination. I think you must plainly see—how can you help seeing?—what the most careless looker-on must see, this disastrous monopolization of France. I would fain think that you have taken the invincible resolution to fight this solemn and decisive battle all along the line, right flank and left, centre and wings; that you feel that confidence in your cause and certainty of yourselves which are a pledge of victory, and that you promise to bring us home soon the spoils of the vanquished, the spoils of these detestable Congregations! (Some applause on the Left.)

The patience of the Right here gave way—no wonder—and in the midst of a storm of angry exclamations, M. Anisson-Duperron was heard to cry out, "This is shameful! It means hatred and civil war!" The republican orator, however, went on. It appears that he had a very vague idea as to what existing laws were really available for the purpose of crushing the Congregations, for he finished his outburst by entreating the Government, if they had no other weapon, to enforce the law against the "International!" He said:

There is one law which I have not yet pointed out to you; one which, nevertheless, has a marvellous fitness in the present case. I will read Art. I. of this law, which is dated, I believe, 1872. "All International associations"—(ironical laughter from the Right; applause from the Left)—The President of the Council requires power; my object is to give him more. The older texts seem to have left him in some hesitation; I am offering him a weapon fresh from the forge, which will do his work to a nicety. I say "All International Associations, which, under any denomination whatsoever, and notably under that of an International Association of labour"—that last is the only word which does not apply to the Congregations—(laughter and applause from the Left)—"having for its object to impede and stop labour"—we know that whenever a Congregation makes a proselyte it makes him an idle drone—(here the Right exclaimed, but were called to order)—"to impede and stop labour, to abolish the right of property"—mortmain is the abolition of modern property—"to abolish the family"—those who preach that celibacy is the perfect state, and make out marriage to be morally lower, who teach their disciples to break family ties and to change their very names when they enter the cloister, are they not real enemies of the family?—"to abolish *La Patrie*"—you know their hymn, "*Save Rome and France*" afterwards,

if there is time !—"to abolish the free practice of religious worship"—they don't abolish that ; certainly not ; they defend it—by the rack, by massacre, by the stake, by torture, always and everywhere ; they patronized it in my own unfortunate country by the assassinations and the "white terror" of 1815 ; you know well what they mean by liberty of worship. "Every such Association by the very fact of its existing, and having branches in French territory shall constitute a criminal infringement of the public peace." . . . Government, it is your work to put an end to this work of destruction, of gangrene, of national death ; you are the nation's servant. Explain to us how and when you are going to do so. (Renewed applause from the extreme Left. Great excitement in the House).

As the French Catholic papers point out, this speech of M. Madier de Montjau's, applauded as it was by a majority of the Chamber, is important as showing how things are going. When he came down, the excellent Catholic orator, M. Keller, undertook to answer him. When he assured the House that it was impossible to separate the cause of the Congregations from that of religion itself, a voice from the Left called out with engaging frankness, "So much the worse for you !" M. Keller made a great point of showing that it was unconstitutional for the Deputies to try to annul a vote of the Senate ; and that the Deputies were thus attempting to make one Chamber all-powerful. This, we think, was a mistake. Theoretically, the two Houses are equal ; each has a right to vote as it pleases. If at any time they find themselves opposed to each other, the Constitution knows no way out of the dead-lock, except such as the good-feeling of each House may discover. On this particular occasion, after some more discussion, the Chamber, by 338 votes to 147 adopted the "order of the day" of M. Devés ; "the House, reposing confidence in the Government, and counting on its firmness in enforcing the laws relative to non-authorized Congregations, passes to the order of the day." The next step was to be taken by the Ministers themselves.

In exactly a fortnight after the vote of the Senate, the *Journal Officiel* published a Report and two Decrees. The Report was addressed by the Minister of Justice, Cazot, and the Minister of the Interior, Lepère, to the President of the Republic. The two Decrees are signed by the President himself, and backed by the signatures of the same Ministers. As these three documents, on the text of which depends the understanding of the exact limits of the present persecution, have never been published in full in English, our readers will be glad to have them placed before their eyes :—

Report to the President of the French Republic.

Paris, March 29, 1880.

MONSIEUR LE PRÉSIDENT :—It is a principle of our public law that no religious corporation, whether of men or of women, may establish itself in France without authorization. This principle is particularly laid down in Clause 11 of the Organic Law of the Concordat of the 18th Germinal, year X.—“The Archbishops and Bishops may, with the authorization of the Government, establish in their dioceses cathedral chapters and seminaries. All other ecclesiastical establishments are abolished,” as well as in Clause 4 of the Decree Law of the 3rd Messidor, year XII.—“No aggregation or association of men or women may henceforth be forced under pretext of religion unless it has been expressly authorized by an Imperial decree, after inspection of the statutes and regulations according to which it is proposed to live in that aggregation or association.”

Notwithstanding these precise dispositions, a large number of corporations, both of men and of women, have been formed in France, especially under the Second Empire and since the events of 1870. A census of 1877 showed the existence of 500 non-authorized corporations, comprising nearly 22,000 religious of both sexes. The public powers have sometimes tolerated and sometimes sought to put an end to this state of things, according to the exigencies of the cases and the demands of public opinion. Who does not recollect, for instance, the celebrated interpolation addressed by M. Thiers to the Ministry of M. Guizot in 1845, and which resulted in the almost unanimous adoption by the Chamber of Deputies of an order of the day requesting the Government to enforce the existing laws on the non-authorized corporations?

A similar case has just occurred. After the discussion of the Bill on higher education, and the declarations that the present Cabinet were led to make before the Senate, the Chamber of Deputies voted on the 16th inst., by an immense majority, the following order of the day :—

“The Chamber, confident in the Government and counting on its firmness in enforcing the laws relative to the non-authorized corporations, passes to the order of the day.” The duty, therefore, of the Executive is to bring the various non-authorized congregations scattered over the territory of the Republic, to conform to the tutelary rules marked out by the legislation in force, and to furnish the proofs without which a longer sufferance cannot be maintained. On these proofs being furnished, the public authorities will have to judge which of these communities can be authorized. Among the non-authorized congregations, however, there is one, by far the most important, the special position of which it is impossible to disregard. We mean the Society of Jesus, which has been at various times prohibited, and against which the national sentiment has always been pronounced. There is not a Government which would venture to propose its recognition to the Legislative Assemblies. To ask this Society now to fulfil the formalities preliminary to its authorization, when it is known before-

hand that that authorization would be refused, would not seem either becoming or dignified. It is certainly preferable to accord it at once a reasonable interval, after which it will cease to exist as a community. The object here is not to persecute its individual members, and strike a blow at individual rights, as it has been attempted, but in vain, to show, but solely to prevent a non-authorized society from exhibiting itself by acts contrary to law. We are, therefore, induced, M. le President, to propose to you two separable decrees to put a stop to the abuses pointed out by the vote of the Chamber, the first decree fixing the interval on the expiration of which the establishments of the Order of Jesuits in France must be closed, and the second decree settling the formalities to be fulfilled by all the other non-authorized communities. We beg you to attach your signature thereto. Accept, Monsieur le President, the homage of our respectful duty.

JULES CAZOT, *Minister of Justice.*

CH. LEPERE, *Minister of the Interior and of Worship.*

II.

DECREE AGAINST THE JESUITS.

The President of the French Republic on the Report of the Minister of the Interior and of Worship, and of the Keeper of the Seals, Minister of Justice.

Whereas Article 1 of the Law of the 19th of February, 1790, provides that "the Constitutional Law of the kingdom shall no longer recognize solemn monastic vows of persons of either sex; consequently the regular orders and congregations in which such vows are taken, are, and remain, abolished in France, so that similar ones cannot in future be established;"

Whereas Article 1, Chapter 1, of the Law of 18th of August 1792; Article 11 of the Concordat; Article 11 of the Law of the 11th Germinal, year X., provide that "The Archbishops and Bishops may, with the sanction of the Government, establish cathedral chapters and seminaries in their dioceses: all other ecclesiastical establishments are abolished;"

Whereas the Decree Law of 3 Messidor, year XII., which pronounces the immediate dissolution of the congregation or association known under the names of Fathers of the Faith, Adorers of Jesus, or Paccanarists, also provide that "All other communities or associations formed on pretext of religion, and not authorized, shall also be dissolved;"

Considering Articles, 291 and 292 of the Penal Code, and the Law of the 10th of April, 1834;

"Considering, that prior to the aforesaid Laws and Decrees the Society of Jesus was abolished in France, under the Old Monarchy, by various Decrees and Edicts, especially the Decree of the Parliament of Paris of the 6th of August, 1762, the Edict of November, 1764, the Decree of the Parliament of Paris of the 9th of May, 1792, and the Edict of May, 1777;

That a Decree of the Court of Paris of the 18th of August, 1826, delivered by all the Chambers united, declares that the present state of legislation is expressly opposed to the re-establishment of the so-called Society of Jesus, 'under whatever denomination it may present itself,' and that it appertains to the public police of the kingdom to dissolve all establishments, aggregations, or associations which are or might be formed in contempt of the Decisions, Edicts, Law, and Decree above mentioned ;

That on the 21st of June, 1828, the Chamber of Deputies referred to the Government petitions pointing out the illegal existence of the Jesuits ;

That on the 3rd of May, 1845, the Chamber of Deputies voted an order of the day, calling for the enforcement of the existing laws, and that the Government set to work to effect their dispersion ;

That on the 16th of March, 1880, after debates in both Chambers, which more particularly bore upon the Order of Jesuits, the Chamber of Deputies demanded the application of the laws on non-authorized congregations ;

That thus, under the different *régimes* which have followed each other, as well as before as after the Revolution of 1789, the public powers have constantly affirmed their right and their will not to endure the existence of the Society of Jesus, when the Society, abusing the toleration accorded it, has attempted to reconstitute itself and extend its influence ;

It is Decreed :

Article 1.—A delay of three months, from the date of the present Decree, is accorded to the so-called aggregation or association of Jesus, to dissolve, pursuant to the above-named laws, and to evacuate the establishments it occupies over the territory of the Republic.

This delay will be prolonged to the 31st of August, 1880, for the establishments in which literary or scientific instruction is given by the association to the young.

Art. 2.—The Minister of the Interior and of Worship, and the Keeper of the Seals, Minister of Justice, are charged—each in his own province—with the execution of the present decree, which shall be inserted in the *Bulletin des Lois*, and in the *Journal Officiel*.

Given at Paris, the 29th of March, 1880.

JULES GRÉVY.

CH. LEPÈRE.

JULES CAZOT.

III.

DECREE AGAINST THE OTHER RELIGIOUS CONGREGATIONS.

*The President of the French Republic on the Report of the
Minister of the Interior and of Worship, and of
the Keeper of the Seals, Minister of Justice.*

Whereas Article 1 of the Law of the 13th and 19th of February, 1790, provides that : "The constitutional law of the kingdom no longer recognizes solemn monastic vows of persons of either sex ;

consequently orders and regular congregations in which such vows are taken, are, and remain, suppressed in France, and like ones may not be established in future ;”

Whereas Article 1, Chapter 1, of the Law of the 18th August, 1792 ; Article 11 of the Concordat, Article 11 of the Law of the 18 Germinal, year X., provides that : “ The Archbishops and Bishops may, with the authorization of the Government, establish cathedrals, chapters and seminaries in their dioceses. All other ecclesiastical establishments are suppressed ;”

Whereas the Decree Law of 3 Messidor, year XII., decides that : “ All congregations or associations formed under pretext of religion, and not authorized, shall be dissolved ;” that “ The Laws which oppose the admission of every religious order bound by perpetual vows, shall continue to be enforced according to their form and tenour ;” that : “ No aggregation or association of men or of women, can for the future be formed under pretext of religion, until it has been formally authorized by an Imperial decree, based on the Statutes and Regulations according to which it is proposed to live in such aggregation or association ;” that nevertheless the aggregations there named shall continue to exist in conformity with the Decrees authorizing them, “ provided that the said aggregations do present, within six months, their Statutes and Regulations, to be examined and verified in the Council of State, on the report of the Councillor of State charged with all affairs regarding Worship ;”

Whereas the Law of the 24th of May, 1825, provides that ; “ No religious congregation of women shall be authorized until the Statutes, duly approved by the Diocesan Bishop shall have been examined and registered at the Council of State, in the form required for the Bulls of a Canonical Institution ;”

That “ The Statutes cannot be approved and registered if they do not contain a clause that the congregation is subject, in things spiritual, to the jurisdiction of the Ordinary ;”

That “ After the examination and registration, authorization shall by a Law be accorded to such of these congregations as did not exist on the 1st of January, 1825 ;”

That “ With regard to such of these congregations as did exist prior to the 1st January, 1825, authorization shall be granted by an ordinance of the King ;”

That, finally, “ No establishment of an authorized religious congregation of women shall be founded, unless previously it have been informed of the expediency and the difficulties of the establishment, and unless the consent of the Diocesan Bishop, and the Notice of the Municipal Council of the Commune in which it is to be founded, be produced on demand, and the special authorization to found the establishment shall be granted by an ordinance of the King, which shall be inserted within fifteen days in the *Bulletin des Lois* ;”

Whereas the Decree Law of the 31st January, 1852, provides that : “ Religious congregations and communities of women shall be authorized by a Decree of the President of the Republic :

"1.—When they shall declare that they adopt, whatever the epoch of their foundation, the statutes already examined and registered at the Council of State, and approved for other religious communities ;

"2.—When the Diocesan Bishop shall attest that the congregations which will present new statutes to the Council of State existed previously to 1st of January, 1825 ;

"3.—When it shall be necessary to unite several communities which cannot longer exist separately ;

"4.—When a religious association of women, that was at first recognized as a community ruled by a local superior, shall show that it was really directed, at the date of its authorization, by a general superior, and that it had formed at that date establishments dependent on her ;

"And that in no case shall authorization be accorded to religious congregations of women, except after the consent of the Diocesan Bishop has been shown ;"

And whereas there are Articles 291 and 292 of the Penal Code and the Law of the 10th April, 1834 ;

It is Decreed :

Art. 1.—Every non-authorized congregation or community is bound, within three months from the date of the promulgation of the present Decree, to take the steps above specified, in order to obtain the recognition and approbation of its Statutes and Regulations, and legal recognition for each of its establishments actually existing.

Art. 2.—The demand for authorization must, within the interval above granted, be lodged at the general *secretariat* of the Prefecture of each department wherein the association possesses one or more establishments.

A receipt will be given for it.

It will be transmitted to the Minister of the Interior and of Worship, who will examine the matter.

Art. 3.—As to congregations of men, a Law shall be enacted. As to congregations of women, following the rule and distinctions established by the Law of the 24th May, 1825, and by the Decree of the 31st January, 1852, either a Law shall be enacted or a Decree made by the Council of State.

Art. 4.—For those congregations which according to the terms of Art. 2 of the Law of the 24th May, 1825, and of the Decree of the 31st January, 1852, can be authorized by a Decree of the Council of State, the formalities to be followed in the examination of their demand, shall be those prescribed by the 3rd Article of the *aforsaid* Law of 1825, in which no change is made.

Art. 5.—For all other congregations, the documents to be produced on the demand for authorization shall be those named above.

Art. 6.—The demand for authorization must name the superior or superiors, their place of residence, and assert that such residence is, and shall remain fixed in France. It must point out whether the association extends beyond France, or is confined within the territory of the Republic.

Art. 7.—To the demand for authorization must be appended:
 1. A list of the names of all the members of the association; this list must specify the native place of each member, and whether he is a Frenchman or a foreigner; 2. The assets and liabilities, as also the revenues and duties of the association and of each of its establishments; 3. A copy of its statutes and regulations.

Art. 8.—The copy of the statutes, the production of which is thus required, must bear the approbation of the Bishops in whose dioceses the association has establishments, and must contain the clause that the congregation or community is subject, in things spiritual, to the jurisdiction of the ordinary.

Art. 9.—Every congregation or community that has not, within the delay above granted, made the demand for authorization together with the informations on which it rests, will incur the application of the Laws in vigour.

Art. 10.—The Minister of the Interior and of Worship, and the Keeper of the Seals, Minister of Justice, are charged, each in his own province, with the execution of the present Decree, which shall be inserted in the *Journal Officiel* and the *Bulletin des Lois*.

Given at Paris, the 29th of March, 1880.

JULES GRÉVY.

CH. LEPÈRE.

JULES CAZOT.

To make these Decrees perfectly clear, it will be necessary to translate Articles 291 and 292 of the Penal Code, referred to in the Decrees themselves.

Art. 291.—No Association of more than twenty persons, for the purpose of meeting together daily or on certain appointed days for purposes, religious, literary, political or other, shall be formed except with permission of the Government, and on such conditions as the public authority shall impose upon the Society. In the number of persons indicated in these Articles are not comprised those domiciled in the house where the Association meets.

Art. 292.—Every Association of the kind described above, which shall be formed without authorization, or which, after having obtained it, shall infringe the conditions imposed, shall be dissolved. The heads, directors or administrators of the Association shall moreover be punished by a fine of sixteen to two hundred francs.

We have inserted these Decrees and other documents *verbatim* because there is every prospect that they will be acted upon to the letter, at least in the case of the Jesuits and the non-authorized congregations of men; and it is certain that Catholics throughout Europe will watch with the greatest interest the course of the events which will begin on the twenty-ninth of June.

The day on which the Jesuit houses, and more especially

the Jesuit educational establishments, are dissolved and closed will be a momentous one for France, and for the Church of France. We learn from official statistics that there are at this moment in France of non-authorized *teaching* congregations of men, 16; of women, 120. The men actually employed in teaching number 1,556, divided among 81 establishments; the women 4,857, in 555 establishments. The Congregations had in their schools in 1878-79, 61,019 scholars, the men having 20,235, the women 40,784. If to the teaching Congregations we add those, non-authorized, who do not teach, we find that there are in France 7,444 religious men, in 384 establishments, and 14,003 religious women, in 602 establishments. These figures by no means give a correct idea of the number of religious in the country, for the majority of the congregations of women are authorized. Some conception of the enormous work done by religious in France may be obtained from the concluding lines of M. Keller's most useful statistical collection. From him we learn that they have at this moment under instruction no less than 2,208,919 children; and that the number of persons whom they otherwise assist and serve, in hospitals, refuges, lunatic asylums, orphanages, and other institutions, amounts to 200,700.

But we have not to deal, for the moment, with the religious Congregations as a body, but only to try to understand what sort of a gap will be left in the religious and civil life of the country by the suppression of the non-authorized congregations. First of all, some 60,000 school-children will be left without teachers; and some 6,413 teachers will have to be provided by the Government. In the next place a large number of orphanages, refuges, and small local works will come to an end, or have to be taken up by other labourers. And in the third place—and this is the most serious of all—the superior education of the country will be most disastrously checked. We are here, it will be understood, referring principally to the Jesuit Fathers, who have in their hands the training and instruction of such a large proportion of the youth of France. The whole number of pupils in the superior schools or colleges of France, including the *Lycées*, private enterprise schools, and the *petits séminaires* is about 153,324. Of these there are in the Jesuit colleges—without counting the *grands séminaires* directed by them—no less than 11,000 scholars in 28 establishments. It is easy to conceive what a serious matter will be the suppression of a body which is so intimately bound up with the education of France. Take, for instance, the city of Paris itself. The Jesuit Fathers carry on no less than three immense educational institutions in the very midst of the splendour, the

noise, and the vice of the great city. First there is the school of St. Geneviève, founded in 1854. This is the celebrated school of the Rue des Postes, now the Rue L'Homond. Here there are some 420 pupils of the best families of France. The course of instruction is second to none in the world. The pupils who pass from it to the great State establishments—the Ecole St. Cyr, the Polytechnic, the Central, the Naval, the Waters and Forests—and succeed so remarkably wherever they present themselves, prove, with an evidence which no one in France thinks of disputing, that this great school is at the head of French “secondary” education. Then there is, in the next place, the Vaugirard School, founded in 1852; a college of 700 scholars, manned by 44 Jesuit Fathers. And thirdly there is the great day-school in the Rue de Madrid, the Ecole St. Ignace, founded five years ago (1874), and through which 700 pupils have passed since its foundation. It is directed by nineteen Jesuit Fathers. If from Paris we pass to the provinces, we find that there is hardly a town of note in all France where the Society has not a large and flourishing college. At Toulouse they have, first of all, the “College of the Immaculate Conception,” where, last year, 184 pupils were being prepared for the Government schools—a school similar to that of St. Geneviève in Paris; and secondly the “College of St. Mary,” which has been thirty years in existence, and which numbered last year no less than 524 pupils. There are 76 Jesuits in Toulouse. At Amiens there are 62 Fathers, and they direct the large College of St. Croix, founded also in 1850, the epoch of the Falloux Education Bill, and counting last year 594 boys. At Boulogne most English visitors know the splendid college which harbours the exiled Jesuits of Metz. When the College of St. Clement at Metz was suppressed by the Prussian Government at the time of the annexation, in 1871, a large number of both workers and scholars emigrated to Boulogne, and there opened school again. This establishment had 350 boys last year. The large College “de Tivoli” at Bordeaux was attended by 578 pupils last year. Like so many of the Jesuit houses of education this one was founded in the eventful year 1850. Thus a generation of French youth have in many places passed through the Jesuit class-rooms. The Bordeaux College has educated 3,500 boys during the thirty years of its existence. At the great naval station of Brest, there has been for the last eighty years a Jesuit college preparatory to the Government Naval School; in 1879 it had 230 inmates. At Le Mans, Lyons, Marseilles, Rheims and Tours, the Jesuit schools have been founded since the Franco-German war; the number of boys at these establish-

ments ranges from 218 to 487. At Dijon and Lille there are large day-schools also founded since 1871. It is remarkable that, of the 28 colleges conducted by the Society, no fewer than ten were founded in 1850, and only five between that date and the fall of the Empire: the remainder, excluding one or two *petits séminaires*, have been opened since the war.

Although the Jesuit Fathers are more deeply engaged in the work of superior education than in anything else, still it is not in this sphere alone that their suppression will leave a void, and will afflict the Catholic people and clergy of France. In order to understand the feeling of France in presence of this fated 29th of June, we cannot do better than glance through the public protestations which have been uttered against M. Grévy's Decrees by the French Episcopate. Nearly every Bishop in France has spoken; indeed, it may be said with truth, that not a single Bishop has kept silence, for the one exception, or the two exceptions, can be readily explained. Their protests have, in nearly every case, taken the shape of a published letter to the President of the Republic; and if President Grévy has read the half of these letters, and digested them, he must feel in some degree unhappy about his two Decrees. What has struck the whole Republican press, and the whole of France and of Europe, is the perfect unanimity of the French pastorate in making common cause with the threatened Congregations, and especially with the Society of Jesus. The *Temps*, a free-thinking Republican paper, moderate in form, but perfectly anti-Catholic in reality, said, towards the end of April, that it was very striking to observe that every one of the Bishops' letters laid it down as a principle that the cause of the Congregations was the cause of the Church. They asserted this with especial emphasis in speaking of the Jesuits. Not one of the protestations then published but had contained a warm defence of the Society. They all refused to distinguish between secular clergy and regular; they all declared, with the Archbishop of Bordeaux, "*Nous sommes solidaires des Jésuites.*" This, the *Temps* declared, was quite a new thing in the French Church; at no previous time, even under the Restoration, would the Bishops of France have consented to make common cause (*se solidarizer*) with the Congregations, and least of all with the Jesuits. The Positivist Journal was wrong; both in 1762, when the Parliament of Paris, under Jansenist influence, wanted to suppress the Jesuits, and again in 1828, at the time of the famous "*Ordonnances*" which closed the Jesuit schools, the French Episcopate had identified themselves with the Society and with the regular Orders in general. Still, it is very remarkable how strong and pronounced is the language of the present hierarchy. It would

not have surprised the world if the ardent and militant spirits, the Freppels and the Perrauds, had spoken very plainly and hotly. But when the studiously moderate, the peaceable, the retiring, the safe Prelates, like Cardinal Donnet, Cardinal Regnier, Cardinal Guibert, have felt it their duty to protest, to entreat, to warn and to threaten, public opinion cannot help being somewhat startled. "I am accustomed," says pathetically the aged Archbishop of Bordeaux, "by word and example to preach respect towards the dignitaries of public authority; and it costs me much to lift up my voice on this present occasion in accents of grief and protestation; but conscience urges me; *I cannot be silent.*" The Bishops agree in two important points; they state unanimously, first, that the regular Orders, though not essential to the Church's existence, are yet the lawful and certain consequence of her teaching; are solemnly approved by the Church, and are in a well-understood sense, necessary to her; and secondly that, in France, they are of the utmost practical utility and the obedient helpers of the Bishops in all pastoral work. It is worth while to cite, on the first point, the eloquent words of the earliest and grandest of the episcopal utterances—the letter to M. Grévy signed by the Archbishop of Tours and his suffragans. One of the signatories is Mgr. Freppel; and we may be permitted to recognize his gifted pen in this splendid manifesto:—

No one can be ignorant, for it is a formal article of the Catholic religion, that the evangelical counsels are a part of Christian morality no less than the commandments; that the observance of the three vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, constitutes a state of perfection, to which not all are called, but which any one to whom God gives the grace ought to be able to embrace without hindrance. To the Church, and the Church alone, belongs the right to regulate the making of this triple vow, and the outward life of the evangelical councils. A religious Order, approved by the Church, becomes a Church institution, which the civil power cannot attempt to suppress without trespassing on ground that is not its own. The civil power has no right to render impossible the observance of counsels which are of divine institution. Admit that the State can touch one Religious Order, and it can destroy them all; religion is unable to put in practice an integral portion of her dogma; she is deprived of institutions, which are her strength and her assistance; and how can you say she is any longer free?

The Cardinal Archbishop of Rouen, speaking on the same subject, eloquently says:—

Doubtless, these Congregations do not constitute the essence of the Church. But they are the Church's natural product, just as the branches spring from the tree. They share in the Church's life, and

they diffuse that life around. They are the Church's organs Suppress them, and you may truly be said to mutilate the Church. (Letter of April 7th).

The Archbishop of Paris, in that sober but very effective language with which his diocese and the Government are now becoming familiar, thus speaks on the same point:—

Religion is attacked, and the Church of France mourns. The religious Congregations are an integral part of Christianity, because they represent, in Christian society, the practice of the evangelical counsels. Their form and manner of life is borrowed from the Gospel itself, and their chief observances from the primitive disciples of our Lord. (Letter of April 12th, 1880).

These explanations seem elementary to Catholics; but in France they are necessary. France, even revolutionary France, is not yet prepared to declare war on Catholicism. The Government knows this well enough, and that is the reason why Cazot, in his Circular of April 2, protested that "the Congregations are not of the essence of the Church. Their presence or their absence has no connection whatever with the freedom of religious worship." "Where shall we stop?" exclaims Mgr. Perraud in his letter of April 15th—

Where shall we stop, and what will become of the independence necessary for our ministry, if the civil power sets itself up as a tribunal to decide what is necessary and what is not necessary to the life of the Church in her normal state? . . . The existence of the Religious Orders is a matter which regards conscience; it is a consequence of principles which legislation and the executive powers are alike bound to respect, until it is shown that these principles are abused to the danger of the public safety.

But the passages of the Bishops' letters in which they speak of the services and good repute of the regular Orders, and notably of the Jesuits, are still more interesting at the present moment. Let us return to the greatest letter of all—that of the Province of Tours (April 4th, 1880):—

The Decrees of the twenty-ninth of March affect the interests of all our dioceses. It is too readily assumed that the regular clergy act and work independently of our Bishops, and constitute a body which is beyond our jurisdiction. Nothing is more untrue. These "auxiliary" priests—they are the first to boast of the name—have been called in by ourselves, and perform no function of the sacred ministry without our permission. Whether in regard to preaching or the administration of the Sacraments, they hold all their power from the Bishops, who can give or withhold that power as long as they please. By the rule of the church—and they never for an instant dream of eluding it—they cannot even have Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament in their own chapels without an authorization. So much for that pretended

"independence," which has no foundation either in Canon Law, or in the practice of those pious Congregations whose humility and obedience edify us so much. And why is it that we invite into our dioceses these chosen priests who by their vows must practise evangelical perfection? Because their help is indispensable to us in the ministry of preaching and the direction of souls. The diocesan clergy, especially in the towns, taken up as they are from morning till night with the thousand details of parish administration, are altogether unequal to the work required on extraordinary occasions, such as, for instance, the Advent and Lent stations, which require long preparation. We should be short of priests for the parishes did not the religious come to our assistance in the direction of our Colleges and our Seminaries. And we may add, that it is our duty, for the sake of freedom and peace of conscience, to provide for our people spiritual directors, at times of missions and in retreats, who shall afford them those lights and that care of which they stand in need. It is *our* rights, therefore, and the rights and interests of our dioceses that these Decrees will gravely compromise.

When they come to speak of the Jesuits, the Archbishop and his suffragans make an eloquent panegyric of the Society, in the present as in the past; they refer to the history of France, and of Europe, to sovereigns, to statesmen, to philosophers, and to poets; then they continue:—

And in our days, too, how can it be pretended that these religious, esteemed as they are and so deservedly esteemed, have the popular feeling against them? Our Catholic people press in crowds round their pulpits; wherever they open a College, the trust and confidence of families fills it instantly; and there are no priests to whom the faithful apply more willingly for the direction of conscience.

Cardinal de Bonnechose speaks in the same strain:—

The Jesuits devote themselves to the laborious and often thankless task of education. They open colleges; experience justifies their efforts; families entrust their children to them with the utmost confidence; year by year, public opinion and the Government itself, testify to their success; year by year, they send forth into every career young men who have been taught to respect authority, who are penetrated with the idea of duty; who are fitted to become brave soldiers, conscientious functionaries, and honourable and useful citizens, and who are every one devoted to their country and ready to die for France. . . . What I say of the Jesuits, I say also of the Dominicans, the Oratorians, the Marists, the Picpussians, the Eudists, and of every-one of the non-authorized Congregations who possess Colleges enjoying public esteem.

And I cannot pass over in silence the great patriarchal families of St. Benedict, St. Bruno, St. Bernard, St. Francis of Assisi, the Carmelites, the Capuchins, the Premonstratensians, the Redemptionists, the Trinitarians, the Brothers of St. John of God, the Trappists, the Oblates, and a multi-

tude of others, whose whole life is consecrated, not to prayer only, but also to study, to scientific toil, to preaching, to agriculture, or to the alleviation of the most neglected and repulsive of human miseries (Letter of April 7).

The Archbishop of Cambrai, Cardinal Regnier, testifies as follows:

The secular clergy are by no means forced to accept the aid of the regulars; but there is not a parish which does not clamour for them and receive them with gratitude. And in truth our diocesan clergy cannot do without them.

Our Religious Congregations are eminently useful, are even necessary to the secular clergy; and by the austere regularity of their life and the services of every kind which they render us, they have won the respect, the affection, the confidence of our Catholic people. Their dispersion will cause deep regret, and most justly.

And here I must make particular mention of the Jesuit Fathers, who are to be treated with special severity.

On my conscience, and in the name of truth, President of the French Republic, I bear witness that these religious men, who have so long been abused, spit upon, and calumniated by the anti-Christian press with a malice which no authority has ever attempted to restrain—who are devoted day by day to the hatred and the violence of the mob as though they were an association of malefactors—that these religious are esteemed and venerated in the highest degree by the clergy and by every class of the faithful, and that they are in every way most worthy of it. Their conduct is exemplary; their teaching can only be blamed by ignorance and bad faith. Many of them belong to the most distinguished families of the country. The house of superior education which they carry on with such brilliant success at Lille, was entrusted to them—I may almost say, forced upon them—by fathers of families who had themselves been brought up by them, and who were determined to provide for their children an education which their own experience taught them to value.

I fulfil a duty of conscience and of honour in addressing to you these simple and respectful observations (Letter of April 8th).

The Cardinal Archbishop of Paris utters these striking words on the Jesuits, so many of whom labour in his diocese:—

Among the religious institutes, there is one which has been more before the world than the others; which has done splendid service in education, which has shed lustre on literature, which has formed *savants* of the first rank in every branch of science, which has sent missionaries to the extremities of the earth, which has carried civilization into the most barbarous countries, and which has made every shore red with the blood of its martyrs. Marked out by its importance and its success as an object of the hatred of the enemies of religion, the Society of Jesus has always confounded calumny by the splendour of its virtues, its intellectual power, and its work. We

have had it in full operation for fifty years in our midst; to appreciate it there is no need to search the pleadings of its dead and gone enemies; it lives and labours under our own eyes; and modern society, which is accused of disowning it, has to thank it for the formation of the best of its children. To zeal, these generous priests have always united prudence. In the midst of the dissensions which trouble and divide the country, just as the whole of the clergy have kept themselves rigorously within the limits of their spiritual ministry, the Society of Jesus has been scrupulously exact in avoiding all interference with politics. Those who deny this, make assertions without proof. A Bishop like myself who has under his jurisdiction the chief Jesuit establishments in France is in a position to know the truth in a matter like this. It is this Society, this renowned Society, which the executive threatens with its extremest rigour. Parliament is not to be asked to recognize it; it is doomed to die; in three months it is to disappear. I believe I may say with truth that the spirit of moderation has always guided my words and my conduct; but on this present condition, you will pardon me if I feel it difficult to restrain my grief. I have grown old with my century; I have witnessed many political changes; I have seen our dear and unhappy country in many a conflict. But a sight, as saddening as it is novel, has been reserved for my declining age. I was to see public liberty violently arrested in its course by party-prejudice, and the central Power dragged back to the ways and practices of forgotten despotism (Letter of April 12th).

The testimony of the Archbishop of Lyons will also be read with interest. Cardinal Caverot finely says:

It is the privilege of the children of St. Ignatius to be in the front of every battle. I know how hatred, and still more how ignorance and prejudice, have accumulated calumnies against the Society. But I owe it to truth to declare here, that in the course of a ministry of well-nigh fifty years—twenty as priest, thirty as Bishop—I have been able to satisfy myself, and I know, that these worthy and zealous servants of God have well deserved the distinction given to the Society by the Church, when she proclaimed it, in the Council of Trent, a "Pious Institute, approved by the Holy See." I admire these men in their work of teaching, and in the labours of their apostleship. Nowhere have I met with priests more obedient to ecclesiastical authority, more careful of the laws of the country, more aloof from political conflict; and I affirm without fear of contradiction, that if these Decrees which strike at them have not made any charge whatever against their life and teaching, it is because not a charge could be made which would survive an hour's discussion (Letter of April 11).

If there were room for further extracts from these admirable letters, the reader would be still more struck with the unanimity, the warmth, and the eloquence of this magnificent simultaneous demonstration of the French hierarchy. Well

worth reading is the long and brilliant letter of the Archbishop of Rheims to the Minister of the Interior (April 12th, 1880); the dignified argument of the Archbishop of Besançon (April 17th), and the ably-reasoned remonstrance, full of telling passages, of the Oratorian Perraud, Bishop of Autun (April 15th). These manifestoes are, indeed, all immediate political considerations apart, very precious for the Religious Orders. The Jesuits, in particular, will be able, from these utterances, to collect a body of episcopal testimony to their ability, devotedness, and deference towards the Bishops such as perhaps they have never before received from a great National Church during the whole course of their existence.

We write on the eve of the day which is fixed for the beginning of the persecution. What will happen, no one can exactly foretell. So far it seems certain that the Government will carry out its Decree against the Jesuits with a ruthless hand. The non-authorized Congregations of women, it is understood, will not be disturbed—for the present. The Congregations of men—the Jesuits excepted—will be called upon, once more, to apply for authorization. And, in regard to the Jesuits' educational establishments, the Decree will not be enforced until August 30th. The 29th of June, then, will apparently bring with it the dissolution of the Jesuit noviciate houses in France, and of all the houses where there are no colleges. We learn from the French journals that the Minister of the Interior—now no longer M. Lepère, but M. Constans—assembled at his official residence in the Place Beauvau on 7th of June, thirty-five Prefects of Departments in which there are Jesuit houses, in order to give them verbal and special instruction how to proceed on the eventful 29th. They were told that if the houses in question were not evacuated by the morning of the 29th—and on this point they were to take care to be informed—they were to send in regular summonses calling upon the inmates to obey the Decrees. If the Jesuits obeyed the summonses, well and good; if they refused to obey, a regular *procès-verbal* of such refusal would have to be drawn up, the usual course would be followed, and the *gendarmes* would be called in to expel the occupants by force. But, continued M. Constans, the houses thus evacuated by force or otherwise, will that be the end of it? The Government is apprehensive that it will not. The Government foresees that it is quite possible that the Jesuits who are driven out on the 29th may come back the next day. What will have to be done in such a case? Will new summonses have to be issued, and fresh *procès-verbaux* drawn up? The Government confesses to some embarrassment on this point. The question of property

is an awkward one to touch. If the houses in question were certainly the property of the Jesuit body, the Government would feel little hesitation in putting its seal upon all of them and upon whatever else was the property of the Society, as other Governments had done many times. But, from what the Government had learnt, it appeared that the houses occupied by the Jesuits did not in reality belong to them, but to a third party. Any interference with them, therefore, would be a violation of the rights of property, and would expose the Government to an interminable series of protests and civil actions. Now the Minister was quite clear that the best thing the Prefects could do would be to avoid as far as possible all suits of this kind. The Jesuits must be kept out of the law courts, and left exclusively to the Executive. And the Minister was not without hope that, at the last moment, things would so turn out that it would be possible to avoid the use of force. He thought that the Jesuits would be advised to make no resistance except so much as was needful to prove they protested against invasion of their rights. If, however, any resistance of an active nature were offered, the Prefects were to consult the Minister by telegraph, and he would reply in the same way.

It is impossible, we repeat, to foretell what turn matters will take. Perhaps by the time these pages are in the readers hands, decisive steps will have been taken, and all will be over. The Jesuits, there is no doubt, will be ably advised, and of course they will act as one man. But, on looking narrowly at the Decrees, it is difficult to help seeing that the Government will have the utmost difficulty in making them effective. It is not that the laws they invoke—obsolete as they are, and stupid as is the attempt to revive them—may not prove sufficient to carry through what they propose. The best lawyers of France, indeed, say that no law quoted in the Government Decrees does authorize the dissolution of a religious institute. We have before us the "Consultation," signed by such eminent names as Berryer, Vatimesnil, and Béchard, which was prepared and published in 1845, at the time when measures very like the Decrees of M. Grévy were threatened against Congregations. The conclusion arrived at by these weighty authorities are, in short: 1. That no law at the present time in force forbids community of life to persons belonging to non-recognized religious associations; 2 That even if such laws did exist, the Executive would have no right to proceed to their dissolution by administrative measures merely—(that is, an Act of the Legislature would be required, or a sentence of a Court of Law); 3. That dissolution by administrative measures would

be impracticable of application and without result.* This "Consultation" and its conclusions received the adhesion of the most able members of nearly forty of the chief "Court," and "Bars" of France.† At the moment that this is written a new "Consultation" has been prepared by M. du Rousse.‡ It is a volume of 300 pages, but it is not yet in the hands of the public, as it has been sent round to all the Bars in order to receive "adhesions." But it is difficult to see what it can add to the keen, dry, and most conclusive argumentation of the older document.

On the very day on which the Decrees came out, the 29th of March, there appeared in the *Paris-Journal* a long and able legal opinion by M. Baragnon, a lawyer of the Nîmes bar, and a Senator. His conclusions are as follows: 1° No existing law forbids the existence of non-authorized Congregations. 2° The Government, if it tried to dissolve or expel them—that is to say, if it tried to expel Frenchmen from their home or from their country—would be permitting an act of arbitrary power against which I should not hesitate to advise legal resistance. He does not, however, indicate what means he would counsel the Congregations to take; before doing so, he says, we must wait to see what the Government will do.

The speech of M. Lamy in the Chamber of Deputies, on the 3rd of May, is one of the most important contributions that have appeared so far in the legal aspect of the question. M. Lamy, who is a lawyer of great reputation, examines one by one the legal texts brought forward in the Decrees, and pronounces that not one of them is applicable. The law of 1790 suppressed Religious Orders as *corporations*, not as associations; the law of 1792, passed at a moment when all was trouble and confusion—passed by an incompetent Assembly, between the terrible 10th of August and the massacres of September—only completes that of 1790; certain secular corporations had continued to exist; the treasury was empty, and these pious associations were rich; they were, therefore, suppressed; suppressed, however, simply as corporations, with the additional prohibition, in 1792, of wearing any monastic or religious habit. The Decree of Napoleon (3 Messidor, year XII.) was utterly illegal. The Decree of the Court of Paris in 1826, though it declares that the law forbids the existence of the Jesuits, pronounces that the Courts cannot touch them.

* The brochure at the head of this article "Les Décrets du 29 Mars" is reprint of this famous "Consultation," accompanied by a few explanatory paragraphs.

† *Le Monde*, 4 Avril, 1880. ‡ See Note at the end of this article.

The King closed the Jesuit schools in 1828, not because Jesuits were illegal, but because the Crown had the monopoly of education and could exclude anyone whom it pleased. And as for 1845, when a Resolution passed the Parliament, very like the "Order of the day" of March 16th, 1880, there came of it nothing whatever; all the Government could do was to send an ambassador to Rome to "arrange" for the withdrawal of the Jesuits from France.

Notwithstanding these weighty opinions, it is to be feared that the French Courts, if the matter ever comes before them, will declare that Religious Congregations are forbidden in France, and will thus justify the measures of the Executive. The legal texts are difficult to explain away. There seems to be not the slightest doubt that the laws of the revolutionary period, the Decrees of the Empire, and the judicial decision of the restoration were all *aimed* against the existence of religious Congregations. In France, the idea has always been that an Association must either be fully recognized by the State, or entirely forbidden. The view that the Revolution intended to suppress the Orders as Corporations and let them go on as Associations, belongs to an order of ideas which does not even yet exist in France. When, in 1850, the Congregations claimed their rights as private citizens and proceeded to re-establish themselves, every one felt that they did this in the teeth of the revolutionary legislation, and in the strength of that entire and complete freedom which consistency forced their enemies to allow them. When passions grow hot, consistency disappears. The extreme Republicans in France have no respect for liberty, as such. There is a school of them who really want other men to be as free as themselves; but that school is not now in the ascendant. The spirit which dictated the "Order of the day" of March 16th, is the same spirit which passed the law of 1790 and of 1792, and which formulated the Revolution of 1845; and it is a spirit which is delighted to ally itself even with the despotism of Napoleon in order to crush its enemies. The only way, perhaps, in which the Congregations could hope to win a legal victory would be to prove that the laws invoked by the Government are really no laws at all. This line of argument, it is observed, has been indicated and followed out in all the documentary "opinions" on the side of liberty. To common sense it would certainly seem the most obvious thing in the world that the mad and hasty edicts of the worst year of the Revolution, and the despotic brutalities of Napoleon, had nothing in common with the majestic idea of "law." The Bishop of Autun, Mgr. Perraud, insists, very strongly, that all anti-congregational legislation previous to the

Restoration has been abolished by subsequent laws, and especially by the formation of the Codes; and that the Royal Ordinances since that have been superseded by the law of 1850. (Letter of April 15th.) This is a point which the legal authorities have not by any means lost sight of; but it is always difficult to make good the abrogation of a law which is not explicitly abrogated.

It would be very rash, however, to presume to say decisively what is the real state of the French Law. And it would probably be useless. These elaborate "Consultations," have a great moral effect on public opinion. But in a matter which is certainly not very clear, the French Courts are almost sure to decide in the sense of the Government. The real defence, before the country, of the Orders, is that these Decrees, even if technically authorized by musty and disreputable laws, are directly in the teeth of the great modern principle of personal liberty. If they stand out on their rights as private citizens of France to live as they please, and dress as they please, and be called what they please, and even to "associate," as they please, they will certainly succeed in the end. It is deplorable that Catholics should have to invoke principles which, when absolutely stated, are impious and disastrous. But the demand, not of absolute liberty, but of relative equality as men and citizens with those who preach equality, is not only allowable but praiseworthy, and even necessary. The Government foresees that the battle may be fought here; and M. Lepère, in his circular to the Prefects of April 2nd, bids them observe that the members of the non-authorized Congregations, "will, the very day after their dissolution, be in precisely the same condition as other French citizens, on the sole condition of obeying the laws which affect every one." "The aim of the Government," he continues, "is not to injure individual liberty, but to prevent the members of Congregations from doing what other citizens may not do." But a Religious Order is surely not an ordinary Association; indeed, the Government speakers always lay stress on the difference between the two. An Order is bound together by a tie which the State cannot recognize; its members when they "assemble," live together in their own houses; their objects are entirely spiritual; and those Articles of the Penal Code which were meant to put a stop to political intrigue have no application to men whose superiors are always warning them against politics, and who, moreover, living as they do in fixed domiciles, can be watched with the greatest ease by the police of a maternal Republic. If the law is technically against them, in the name of every republican principle let the law be altered.

But, after all, what can the French Government do? It cannot suppress the Jesuits. It has pledged itself not to banish them from France. It can expel them from their houses; it is uncertain whether it can prevent them from going back; or whether the Courts may not support them in their claims to live as they choose. But even if it prevents them living in large establishments and calling themselves Jesuits, can it hinder them from being Jesuits just as much as ever—from continuing to live in France, in smaller societies and as ordinary priests, but always owning the same obedience and preserving the same organization? Persecution, to be successful, should be thorough. In this instance the Jesuits will be annoyed, and the Catholic people will be irritated; but as long as the Bishops support them and Catholic parents trust them, there seems no reason why they should not go on with their preaching and their educational work very much in the same way as hitherto.

In the meantime, the "Decrees" of M. Grévy, like a tempest which rouses the powers and braces the energies of men, have done more good in France than their promoters could desire. They have called forth a pastoral declaration from a united hierarchy that the Religious Orders are "necessary" to the Church's well-being and the true outcome of Catholic teaching; they have been the occasion of a touching demonstration, through all France, that the Congregations, and especially the Jesuits, have endeared themselves to the Bishops, the diocesan clergy, and the people. The letters of the Bishops have been published in every corner of the land, and the enormous Catholic majority in France has been instructed that the men now in power are laying their hands upon the Church's sacred trust. The French Catholic masses wanted something like this to rouse them. Nothing could happen more fortunately—unless the Government could be induced to decree the expulsion of the Sisters of Charity. There seems now, indeed, to be an opening for a grand Catholic campaign, in the name of constitutional liberty. If an association were formed, funds collected, and the press organized; if, above all, a leader could arise; and if by every possible legal means the present persecutions were resisted—then it would be impossible that the dead weight of Catholicism should not tell in the long run, and the whole country would be so well prepared for the next election—when M. Gambetta is to bid for supreme power—that arrangements, transactions, and compromises, would easily be discovered whereby the Church and the Congregations would be let alone, and France would be both more peaceful and more free.

* * As we are going to press, we receive the "Consultation" of M. Rousse, Advocate in the Court of Appeal, Paris.

This document, which will form a volume of 300 pages octavo, is published in the *Gazette des Tribunaux* of June 13. The conclusions at which M. Rousse arrives are precisely those three at which M. Vatimesnil arrived thirty-five years ago, and which have been given in the body of the preceding article, and they are couched in the same words. No existing law prohibits persons belonging to religious associations from living together; the Government, in any case, cannot dissolve them by way of "Administration," but must recur to the Courts of Law; and if they attempt to dissolve them by the Administrative or the Executive force, they will find it impossible to carry out their designs. M. Rousse has embodied in his "Opinion" the whole of the "Consultation" of 1845; but he has added a good deal of his own. He submits the whole of the laws, edicts, ordinances and decrees on which the Government relies, to a searching analysis, taking them in order of time, and citing them in full. He explains their terms, shows how they have been applied, what their results have been, and what is the actual state, at the date of these Decrees of 1880, of the religious Congregations, in regard to the present powers of the French Government. We have a very striking *résumé* of the condition of the Religious Orders under the *ancien régime*; of their continual efforts to place still heavier fetters on the monasteries, and the abuses to which this led; and we have a description of the numerous "suppressions" of the Society of Jesus—by law courts, however, be it observed—before the Revolution. Then we come to the law of 1790; M. Rousse analyses it in two words; it was a decree of "civil death" to the community, and of "civil life" to each religious; and the religious could leave their houses or continue to reside in them as they pleased. Taking in their order the other *visés* of the Government, M. Rousse criticizes them in the same spirit as M. Vatimesnil. But his "Opinion" is valuable for a certain amount of positive information in addition to the negative criticism which chiefly distinguished the "Consultation" of 1845. M. Rousse takes his stand on the Constitution of 1848 and the laws in favour of liberty which have since that time been passed. Articles 7, 8 and 9 of that Constitution (which he quotes) distinctly lay down, for every French subject, liberty of conscience, liberty of association, liberty of teaching. The celebrated law of 1850 most unequivocally asserts that every Frenchman, of full age, may open a free school, no conditions being required except certain enumerated guarantees of capacity and good conduct. Before this article was voted, a discussion

took place in the Assembly precisely on the question whether religious Congregations ought to be allowed to teach—or rather (for this was the real question) whether the Congregations were to be allowed to exist. In this discussion M. Thiers took a prominent part. Among other things he said: "It is the Constitution, not we, that admits the Congregations to teach! 'We shall have the Jesuits opening schools,' you say; but how, in the name of your principles, can you help that? Under the old *régime*, with its limited freedom, that was possible; but you will have no restrictions on freedom. You despise the old *régime*, and yet here you are adopting one of its small tricks, its petty jealousies—you say, 'We will have no more of the Jesuits.'"

And liberty carried the day by a large majority. But the Left were not content. A second attempt was made to exclude the Jesuits from the schools. M. Thiers interfered again, and implored the Assembly to do one thing at a time—to pass the School Law first, and then, at some future time, to discuss whether a Congregation should exist or not. He was listened to; the School Law was voted; it was arranged that within a year's time a Bill on Associations should be brought in. But the year passed, and nothing was done, and nothing has been done up to the present moment.

No sooner was the School Law of 1850 passed than the Congregations, accepting that law as their warrant, opened schools everywhere. The Religious Orders, especially the Jesuits and the Dominicans, claimed and enjoyed, during the eighteen years of the Second Empire, full liberty of association, and full liberty of teaching. After the war, there was, to say the very least, the greatest hesitation on the part of governments and majorities in adopting any measure which seemed an interference with freedom of religious association. There was a discussion on the very subject in 1872, and an influential deputy, M. Brisson, declared, amidst marks of general approval, that no one wanted to revive the laws which forbade "religious association." In 1875, the Government presented to the National Assembly a Bill on Higher Education. This Bill expressly derogates the well-known clause in the Penal Code, in favour of "teaching associations" for higher education; and when the question of the "religious" was again raised, the Reporter of the Committee declared there was no need to discuss the matter. "Religious liberty," he said, "is not less admirable than other kinds of liberty, and we have no right to exclude from teaching Frenchmen and citizens, merely because they believe themselves called to a sacred vocation." And the discussions on Article 7 of the Ferry Bill, are still fresh in every one's recollection. Both the Deputies and

the Senate knew very well that the real question at issue was the right of the Congregations to exist; and this gives force to the eloquent speeches made by such men as Dufaure, Jules Simon, and others, in favour of liberty. "I hold that clause," said the aged M. Dufaure, "to be a reactionary clause, contradicting a principle of the Constitution of 1848, repeated and organized in the laws of 1850 and 1875, and contrary to the very essence of a republic which lives by the spirit of freedom, as we declared in 1871." Not the least interesting part of M. Rousse's exposition is the conclusion, in which, partly following his predecessors, he demonstrates the difficulty, nay, the absolute impossibility, of putting the Government decrees in force. The strong hand can, of course, do anything; but there are some exercises of power which cause too deep a disturbance to be lightly ventured upon. We hear from France that this "Consultation" has already produced a profound sensation. The author's eminent position, his calm impartiality, his argumentative power, and the clearness of his style, have carried conviction to many who doubted. On the other hand, the Government threatens force and seems prepared to employ it; and the Radical papers are backing it up with energy and relish. What the 29th will actually bring forth, it is, as we have said, impossible to predict. The Jesuit Fathers have as yet given no sign of the course they will adopt. But meanwhile France and the Catholic world are praying. There are pilgrimages to Paray-le-Monial, to La Salette, to St. Michel. During the whole of the week beginning June 27 there are special devotions, now in the Rue de Sevres, now at Montmartre, now at the tomb of St. Geneviève, at Notre Dame des Victoires, at Notre Dame de Paris and the Crown of Thorns. In the provinces, all the great sanctuaries will be thronged. We cannot be sure that God will deign to humble the persecutor or to open the eyes of the blind. But we trust and know that He will give to His confessors strength in the hour of trial, and triumph at the last.

Notices of Catholic Continental Periodicals.

GERMAN PERIODICALS.

(By DR. BELLESHEIM.)

1. *Katholik*.

THE February number contains a biography of the late Very Rev. Dr. Molitor, Canon of Spire. He was born in 1819, at Zweibrücken, and applied to the study of law in order to be called in due time to the bar, but very soon afterwards took to theology. After being ordained priest, he was appointed vicar near Spire, and then nominated a Canon of the Cathedral. Widely and thoroughly accomplished in Theology, and Canon and Civil Law, he rose in the course of time to be one of the most influential men in Catholic Germany. Amongst his works, the following deserve special mention :—“The Process Prescribed by Canon Law to be Observed in trying the Clergy,” and the exposition of Innocent III.’s decretal “*Per Venerabilem*” in which that great Pope establishes the Holy See’s indirect power in temporal matters. This work would of itself suffice to immortalize its author. Eminent for his knowledge of ecclesiastical law, Canon Molitor was summoned to Rome to be Pontifical Theologian in the Vatican Council, and afterwards was commissioned to translate Ceconi’s “*Storia del Concilio Ecumenico Vaticano*” into German. Accomplished as an orator, Canon Molitor excelled also as a poet, and wrote many fine dramas. Some of these rival the best productions of our great German poets—*e.g.*, “*Claudia Procula*” “*Maria Magdalena*,” and “*Julian the Apostate*.” They, for the most part, describe the formidable struggle between Christianity and Heathenism. As a similar war is waged in our days, Canon Molitor published a series of novels and romances denouncing the manifold false doctrines which the church has to deplore. The desire of the Catholic people that Dr. Molitor, who was also an eloquent preacher, should be nominated a Bishop, was not to be fulfilled, owing to political reasons ; the King of Bavaria enjoying the privilege of nominating. The February and March numbers contain a learned treatise on the idea of Personality according to St. Thomas. In the April issue we have the first part of a treatise on the Beatific Vision. The scholastic doctrine is very ably developed. After having expatiated on the several kinds of “species,” by which we attain the cognition of external things, and established the absolute necessity that the intellect should be “proportioned” to the things it desires to know, the author discusses the doctrine of the “*lumen gloriæ*.” He calls it “an inherent quality,” and adheres to the doctrine of those divines who claim it as a privilege of the saints

in heaven. An exception to this common law is admitted by some theologians for the Blessed Virgin only. The light of glory as a supernatural habit influences reason and will; but as it is only a faculty, a further special divine assistance is required in order that it may be actually exercised. It is contained as a germ in sanctifying grace. After the perusal of these treatises bearing on the most sublime doctrines of metaphysics and dogmatic theology, the reader may repose and recreate his mind by going through the instructive contribution on the Frankfurt and Magdeburg "Confession books" of the fifteenth century. It is a common belief with Protestants that in mediæval times, and principally in the period immediately followed by the so-called Reformation, even the very beginnings of spiritual life were unknown to the Catholic people. The church is taunted with having only insisted on the performance of external works, laying no stress on interior conversion and repentance for sin. One of the most striking proofs of the utter injustice of such a reproach is afforded by these confessions, which were largely used in Germany in the old Catholic times.

2. *Historisch-politische Blätter.*—To the February issue I contributed an account of the very instructive work published last year in Paris by the son-in-law of the late Count de Montalembert, Vicomte de Meaux, under the title "*Les Luttes Religieuses en France au Seizième Siècle.*" The contents of this work may be summed up in the following sentence: The history of French Protestantism in the sixteenth century is the history of religious toleration. It may surprise the reader, but it is true. Whilst Protestant England did not scruple to crush a religious minority by the most barbarous laws, surpassing even those invented by heathen governments against Christians, and whilst Germany saw established in her public law the principle of Cæsarism, which gives religious liberty only to the nobles, but not their subjects, Catholic France was sanctioning religious liberty even for those who professed a religion inconsistent with the official religious belief of the country. It cannot be denied that French Protestants were exposed to great hardships, or, to speak more accurately, that the civil laws which condemned to death whoever dared to profess any religion but the Catholic, and to disregard the public law which for centuries bound together the Church and civil society, were unrelentingly carried out against them. But it must be borne in mind that the French Kings in punishing heretics acted not so much as defenders of the Catholic religion, as in their quality of secular princes, whose kingdom was inseparably connected with the Catholic Church. But as soon as Catholic France became aware of the total uselessness of the severe punishments enacted by a legislation for use in times gone by the Huguenots under Henry II. were presently allowed religious liberty. The general feeling prevailing in that period in France was well expressed by the Chancellor l'Hôpital, when he uttered the "*parole étonnante*": "*plusieurs peuvent être cives, qui non erunt Christiani.*" Certainly it cannot be denied that the exercise of the new religion was to be confined to a certain number of towns, villages, and

castles of the nobility ; but, one would be grievously mistaken by assuming the reason of this measure to be hatred of religion. On the contrary it was dictated by love of peace which could be preserved only by such a law. It is to be observed that it was the very champion of the new religion in France, Henry of Navarre, who energetically exerted himself to enact such a partial exercise of religious liberty, the only safeguard of mutual forbearance of Catholics and Protestants. The accurate researches of the Vicomte de Meaux, irrefutably destroy also the inveterate mistake handed down from generation to generation, that French Protestants acquired religious liberty only by the Edict of Nantes ; on the contrary, the latter only established in a more solemn form what they had enjoyed for twenty years and more. It may even be granted that French subjects professing the new religion were more favoured by law than Roman Catholics. We principally refer the reader to de Meaux's exposition of the peace of St. Germain (1570), which granted the Protestants "free access to the universities, schools, hospitals, and to all magistracies and honours, peculiar judges for deciding their trials, and also special burying-places." Nay, the perusal of the work forces one to observe, that in consequence of religious liberty, Huguenots very soon became a State within the State, and so grew to be an evident danger to France. Eminently worth reading are the chapters bearing on the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, the accession of Henry IV. to the French throne, and the new life which sprang up in the French Church in the reign of Henry IV. The Massacre of St. Bartholomew has nothing to do with Catholic religion, or Catholic interests. The Dowager Queen, Catherine de Medicis, whose cunning and craft were only exceeded by her "*affetto di signoreggiare*," unfortunately exercised an almost unlimited power over her son Charles IX., and mother and son must be indicted before the tribunal of history as being concerned in this crime. A question of the utmost importance was before Catholic France in 1584 when the last of the Valois expired. The next heir to the crown was Henry of Navarre, the leader of the Huguenots. Was a Protestant by the public law of France allowed to wear the crown ? Evidently not. When the Paris Parliament met, a decree was issued stating that the "most Christian King" ought to be a Frenchman and a Catholic. No sooner, therefore, had Pierre d'Epinai, Archbishop of Lyons, and orator of the League, announced the purpose of Henry to return to the Catholic religion, than the civil war was brought to an end. Henry IV. was instructed by the bishops in the religion of his ancestors, professed the faith July 25, 1593, in St. Denis, and not only remained faithful to his religion personally, but also exerted himself to improve the condition of the Catholic Church in France and fulfil the commands which the Holy See had laid down, when he was reconciled and admitted to the Catholic religion. Amongst these conditions rank foremost the education of the heir apparent in the Catholic religion, and the foundation of two convents in every province and in the country of Béarn. Hence we see the religious life flourishing as it had seldom done

before this period, when State and Church were bound together. And as Henry IV. called to the vacant episcopal sees persons distinguished for learning and piety, the Catholic religion entered on a new period, which in the course of time developed into the "siècle" of Louis XIV. Vicomte de Meaux's work, founded as it is on the most scrupulous study of history, and principally the recently published documents of the time, claims the attention of Catholics of all countries. In the second issue (March) is contained an article on "Napoleon's Marriage with Josephine," in which the Rev. Dr. Knöpfler, of Tübingen, thoroughly establishes the fact that this marriage was truly valid, sacramental, and hence indissoluble. The author refutes the opinion recently published in his memoirs by Prince Metternich, who vindicated the sentence of the Paris Ecclesiastical Commission declaring null and invalid the Emperor's marriage with Josephine Beauharnais. Our author brings before us a far more trustworthy man, the Count d'Haussonville, in his valuable work, "*L'Eglise romaine et le premier empire, 1800-1814.*" According to him it was Pope Pius VII., who, as soon as he became aware that the Empress was only civilly married, insisted on the immediate celebration of a marriage "*in facie ecclesiæ*," and gave all faculties to Cardinal Fesch, who in the presence of Talleyrand and Bertier as witnesses, assisted in the chapel of the Tuilleries at the ecclesiastical marriage. Cardinal Fesch drew up a document which he handed to the Empress. When the Emperor sought for a divorce, the Empress, although extremely reluctantly, gave way to her husband's pressing petitions and delivered the document to him. It has disappeared for ever. The fact that the Pope kept silence as to Napoleon's second marriage with an Austrian princess, is to be accounted for by the captivity in which he was detained. In case he had enjoyed full liberty, without any doubt he would have denounced the Emperor's proceeding and taken the same course as Clement VII. in the time of Henry VIII. of England.

3. *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*.—Father Ehrle continues discussing the bearings of the Encyclical issued by Leo. XIII. on the Restoration of the Catholic Philosophy. He advances most important internal and external reasons which require us to take St. Thomas as the leader to be followed in this work of restoration. There could only be a choice between him on one side, and St. Bonaventura or Scotus on the other hand. But St. Bonaventura is a far more developed mystical nature, and in his commentary on the sentences of Peter Lombard sometimes only reproduces the latter; and Scotus may be an acute thinker, but he lacks not only the deepness, but also the clearness of St. Thomas. Another prerogative of St. Thomas is that he enjoyed as his teacher Albert the Great, who for the first time introduced the study of Aristotle into the Christian Philosophy. Lastly, it is to be observed, that St. Thomas, in editing the two great *Summas*, sought to meet the necessities of the students who longed for a text-book. For this purpose the two immortal works are eminently adapted. Among external reasons may be adduced the recommenda-

tions of the Holy See and the most eminent theologians from the thirteenth century, down to our time. Our author very accurately comments on the great opposition which St. Thomas's doctrine met with for almost a century; but at last it proved stronger than all its assailants. It was principally in England that the Franciscans, who had two extensive schools both in Oxford and Cambridge, opposed St. Thomas, but at last they were obliged to submit. In the April issue, F. Ehrle goes on to establish the high esteem in which St. Thomas generally was held in the period *after* the Reformation, not only by the Dominicans, but by all religious orders and also by the principal theologians belonging to the secular clergy. And what ought not to be forgotten is, the almost insane fury of the Reformers against our Saint. It is a very strong proof for the excellence of his doctrine. F. Von Hummelauer expatiates on "Ancient Christian Times and their Relation to Physical Science," adducing from every century striking proofs of the undeniable fact that the Catholic Church has promoted the investigation of Nature, inasmuch as it affords a means for ascending from the creature to the Creator.

ITALIAN PERIODICALS.

La Civiltà Cattolica. 15 Maggio, 1880.

The Italian Revolution in a Cleft Stick.

AN article in the *Civiltà Cattolica* of the 15th May, entitled "La Rivoluzione Italiana al bivio", which we might freely render as "The Italian Revolution in a Cleft Stick," represents it as standing where two roads branch off, each leading to destruction, and under the necessity of making a choice. Since the Revolution took possession of Italy there has been no peace for the country. Its professed liberators promised wonders, but no real change was witnessed, except a progressive increase of misery, suffering, and crime. Complainants were told to wait until the unification was completed, but after Rome, the predestined capital, had been won, and Venice "emancipated," and yet there was no prospect of deliverance from evils which, on the contrary, became every day more intolerable, the smouldering anger at last burst into a flame, and in 1876 the men who had "made Italy" by all their nefarious arts, and had made her miserable also, were thrust aside, and others called to the helm of Government. These men were as liberal of promises as their predecessors, and pledged themselves to repair all past injustices and remove every abuse. The Reviewer proceeds to inquire how, during the last four years of power, the Left has fulfilled its engagements. The present wretched state of things is sufficient answer to this question. Instead of providing for the interests of the country, the leaders have been exclusively occupied in securing the attainment of their own selfish ends or those of the small fraction of the Left to which they belong; for, not only does no such thing as a national representation exist, but neither can it be said that in the chamber itself regular Government

and Opposition parties are to be found, as is the case in the Parliaments of other modern constitutional States. The particular men in power keep their places because they are there, and the rest of the dominant oligarchy who at present rule Italy are only hindered from unseating them by their own internal divisions. All are discontented, all loudly declaim, all upbraid and curse each other, both within and out of Parliament, and tax each other with doing no better than the Right. And this is most true, for there is really no divergence in the political aims of the Right or the Left. If there were only portfolios enough for all the leading men of both parties, they might very well hold office together.

A proof of the immoral selfishness which prompts the rulers of Italy to sacrifice everything to their own personal ambition was given the other day, when, in order to humiliate the Right, the Left was not ashamed actually to reproach that party with the seizure of Rome, flinging in their faces the iniquitous arts by which they had succeeded in installing themselves on the Capitol. Farini, the President of the Chamber, ventured gravely to rebuke them for thus lowering the majesty of Italy, but he paid dearly for this proof of his courage. His own party rebelled against him, and for the sake of his personal dignity he felt himself constrained to resign his post. Neither the Government nor the so-called representatives of the nation know what they would aim at, nor what they would do, yet all feel that there is no getting on in this fashion, and anxiously look out for a solution. But is there one to be found? The Reviewer confidently replies, *none*, and gives his reasons, which are briefly these. He was writing when the dissolution of the Chamber had not yet been resolved upon, but he clearly saw that either a Ministerial or a Parliamentary crisis was imminent, and yet in neither case could the difficulty of the present situation be removed. A change of Ministry would be only a change of men, and could but lead to a continuation of the same indecorous comedy which the Left has been playing for the last four years with its alternation of ministries, Depretis, Cairoli, Depretis, Cairoli, Cairoli—Depretis. On the other hand, no substantial change in the situation could be expected from a new Parliament, for it was impossible, constituted as things are, for any very different political condition to result from the elections; and this is the opinion of all competent judges. Vainly would men shut their eyes to the true cause of the ruinous state of affairs. It is to be found in the absolute division between the rulers and the ruled, a division happily described by a saying of the senator Signor Jacini, which has been seized on and adopted. The former constitute *legal* Italy, the latter *real* Italy. The distinction is most accurate, for the men who ought to represent the needs and desires of twenty-eight millions of Italians, represent only themselves and their paltry private ambitions. They are elected by a very limited constituency, interested or bought, and mostly belong to the legal profession, or are mere political adventurers, with no status in the country. Between them and the country, in short, there is a chasm; they are a mere nucleus of individuals who have as much to do with the nation as have the satraps of Persia or the mandarins of China.

Such an artificial Government can only get on by a succession of stratagems and fictions, and, if such fail at last, it comes to a standstill, with the alternative of going forward towards certain destruction or of dying of inanition. Up to 1870 the leaders of the Revolution were combined in the purpose of destroying the temporal power of the Holy See, which was an obstacle to their unchristian designs; this served as a certain bond of union and furnished an object of external struggle. "We shall stick together," said Guiseppe Ferrari in April, 1870, "as long as possible, from the necessity of making head against the Pontiff." But when this external struggle came to an end, legal Italy was thrown upon internal dissensions and conspiracies to keep up some semblance of life, and not only did Right and Left mutually conspire against each other, but even men of the same party did the like, leading thereby to a Babel of confusion such as we now witness. A State reduced to such disorganization can no longer make a step without falling into the horrors of anarchy or of civil war, a result which the republican and socialistic demagoguery daily threaten. On such occasions, a Government has sometimes recourse to the desperate experiment of a foreign war, because in face of the enemy it becomes possible to create a centre of union, and victory may serve to allay the jealousies of internal faction. Many are ready to embrace this expedient, and raise the cry of war against Austria for "Italia irredenta;" and, perhaps, before long the Italian revolution may be urged on to adopt this course in spite of the miserable state of the army, the still more wretched plight of the navy, an exhausted treasury, and an impoverished people. Such a war would be inevitably disastrous, as Alberto Mario confesses in the journal *La Lega*, where he says that a rupture with Austria would "plainly entail the certainty of defeat and of the decomposition of Italy." But opponents treat such assertions as blasphemy, and perhaps it may not be possible to restrain the impatient much longer; perhaps the Revolution may see no other way of escape except war. On which course, then, will legal Italy resolve? War with the foreigner, or civil war? Whichever choice is made, there can be little doubt but that it will lead to destruction. There is, in fact, but one way of salvation open to Italy—to retrace its steps, cast itself at the feet of the Pontiff, cancel irreligious laws, repair past injustice, and place in power men who will consult the weal of the country and respect the sanctity of Catholicism. Either there is this way or there is none; either re-action or the abyss; Catholicism or death; the Pope or ruin.

A SUCCESSION of solid articles is now in process of appearing in the *Civiltà Cattolica* on one of the most urgent questions of the day, that between masters and operatives, capital and labour. The new school of poetry, styled *Verismo*, continues also to be treated. The article in the May number sums up its remarks by pronouncing the new school as detestable, for it does not know how to represent in its artistic forms that very humanity which it pretends to substitute for the great Christian ideals. Its men resemble the most

despicable of women, while its women are degraded still further below the type of womanhood. If now and then you chance upon a pretty strophe, or a happy inspiration, it is the exception, and concerns some trivial matter. It is a nest of nightingales, or a child's fair curly head, or some piece of domestic playfulness, which affords this relief in the midst of a mass of rubbish or worse than rubbish. But nothing will you meet with which appertains to the true life of humanity; these little scraps of Nature and prettiness regarding only its least and most accidental belongings.

La Scuola Cattolica. 31 Marzo—30 Aprile, 1880.

St. Benedict and St. Catherine of Siena.

Two articles in the *Scuola Cattolica* for March and April, amongst longer and more elaborate ones on important questions of the day which our limited space forbids us to notice, will be read with interest at the present moment. The first is on St. Benedict and civilization, and briefly sketches the gigantic work accomplished in times of barbarism by him and his children. Saints—those men truly great—are the salvation of the world. God raises them up from time to time in His Church. Such we need at this day, when disorder, moral, social, and political, has invaded every class as it had in the fifth century, albeit in a different form. The second, entitled St. Catherine of Siena and the Papacy, vindicates that great saint from the misrepresentations of the despoilers of Pius IX., who have actually claimed her as a witness in their favour, and quoted her words in excuse of their sacrilegious and iniquitous deeds. St. Catherine is here triumphantly proved to have been very far removed in thought, word, and deed from being a "patriot" of their stamp.

FRENCH AND BELGIAN PERIODICALS.

Revue Catholique. Avril et Mai, 1880. Louvain.

IN two articles in these numbers of the *Revue*, M. E. Vandelaat gives an interesting account of a "Free Colony at Port Breton" (Oceanica), which is being formed by a Breton gentleman, M. Ch. Du Breil, Marquis de Rays. The Marquis de Rays is the possessor of a large fortune, but instead of enjoying it at home, he prefers to use it and his signal talents as an administrator, in organizing a free colony for New Britain. "I wish," he has said, "to colonize for God and for France;" that is to say, he hopes to create in that distant island "a new France worthy of the old, and where the laws of the Catholic Church will be held in honour; to raise also from their profound degradation the unfortunate peoples of that part of Oceanica and to civilize them; neither to drive them back into the forests nor to annihilate them." The colony of Port Breton is to be a work of religious civilization. The small and weak tribes are not to be con-

demned to destruction in the struggle for existence with a more powerful and energetic race—they are to be helped and protected, gathered into a confederacy and encouraged to the difficult task of self-government. To support the action of the Catholic missionaries among them is to be the privilege of the European colonists. "Wherever Catholic Missionaries have been able to act freely and without impediment, the degraded races have little by little been raised to civilization." In Australia there is a most remarkable exemplification: on one side, in spite of all the English Government has been able to do to the contrary by schools and Protestant missionaries, the aborigines rapidly disappear; on the other, not far from Perth, on the west coast, the monks at New Nursie have, among other wonderful results, civilized a large number of these natives, considered the most degraded type of the human race. The Marquis de Rays, says, enthusiastically: "The monks founded old France, and they will found New France." The first step in colonization has already been made. The first ship (the *Chandernagor*) left Flushing in September last, with a large and chosen body of sailors, agriculturists, workmen, &c., under the direction of le Baron de la Croix, the future commander of Port Breton.

A second ship has just left Barcelona for Port Breton, by way of Suez and Singapore, taking a large number of volunteers, a company of *gendarmes* recruited from among the best Spanish soldiers of the old army of Don Carlos, and a number of Benedictine religious charged by the Propaganda to establish among the natives missions and schools of agriculture. The large funds in hand and the numerous applications now permit the organization of a third expedition. This will go in the steamer *India*, and will consist of a hundred families of Italian, Spanish, and French farmers, who possess sufficient means to pay their way and build their own houses on their arrival. The Marquis de Rays, who has created and executed this work in ten months, is familiar with the regions he goes to colonize, and has lived there a long time; he knows the people and the difficulties to be expected.

The German Government has made great efforts to create a maritime empire in Oceanica; its attention was particularly called to the islands of the Archipelago of New Britain by Capt. F. Von Schleinitz, charged in 1874 with a scientific mission in those parts, but up to the present no Government has taken possession.

Will the colony succeed? There is no want of funds, of able leaders associated with the Marquis de Rays, or of enthusiasm. The advance guard in the waves of modern colonization has generally been composed of more or less worthless adventurers, selfish, immoral, cruel: in this case the conditions most likely to succeed, both morally and socially, have been carefully considered. The Papuas, the native tribes, are simple, open and hospitable; it may be confidently predicted that they will neither refuse the advantages offered by the new settlers, nor use treachery or foul play to rid themselves of their presence. The motives of the founders of the colony are pure and

elevated—neither aggrandizement nor fame—but the conversion and civilization of the natives. The signal success of the missionaries who accompany them is more than all an augury of happy results.

The reader will find a lengthened, but interesting, description of the islands and the plans and methods to be adopted, in these two articles of the *Revue Catholique*.

Notices of Books.

A Brief Reply to Dr. Bain on Free Will. Reprinted from the *Mind* of April, 1880. By W. G. WARD, D.Ph. London: Burns and Oates. 1880.

WE have great satisfaction in calling attention to this further contribution of Dr. Ward to his admirable papers on "Free Will," which, by his courtesy, we are enabled to incorporate in the present number of this REVIEW. Dr. Ward has lately found a new audience for his philosophical articles, and, whilst we should think it extremely hard that he should altogether abandon our own pages, it cannot but be a matter of satisfaction to all who care for Christian truth and sound philosophy that his writings are actually receiving that recognition from non-Catholic thinkers which is implied in the criticisms of the *Spectator*, of Mr. Shadworth Hodgson, and of Dr. Bain himself.

The reply to Dr. Bain does not contain much that is novel to those who have followed Dr. Ward's articles. Dr. Bain had criticized him in the third edition of "The Emotions and the Will," Dr. Ward had replied in two articles in the DUBLIN REVIEW of last year, and Dr. Bain had again rejoined in *Mind*. "In April last" (1879), says Dr. Ward, "whilst cordially acknowledging that Dr. Bain had treated me with most abundant courtesy—I was nevertheless obliged to complain that throughout his criticism he did not so much as once refer to that central and fundamental argument on which I avowedly based my whole case. On the present occasion I must repeat the same acknowledgment and the same complaint." He contents himself, therefore, with stating and enforcing, by new illustrations, his own position, and then answering one by one the somewhat petty and thin objections of his adversary. The Paper is, as usual with Dr. Ward, full of light, of vigour, and of pregnant philosophic thought.

A Life's Decision. By T. W. ALLIES, M.A. London: C. Kegan Paul. 1880.

THIS is a book which, it is not too much to say, is second in interest of its kind only to the "Apologia" of Cardinal Newman. Mr. Allies has here given us the steps of his conversion—the record of the

ways and means by which God led him, of the surroundings which affected him, of the eminent men who influenced him, in taking the "decision" which, momentous as it was at the time, grows more solemn and more wonderful to contemplate every year that he recedes further away from it.

By what grace of God, by what concurrence of my own will with that grace, by what gradual steps, and amid what conflicting currents of passions, interests, and convictions—being born and bred a Protestant, and having, when my education was completed, after three years' travel in Catholic countries, not only no inclination towards Catholicism, but the strongest prejudice against it—I yet, in after times, when my course in life was taken, when all external well-being and prosperity for myself, my wife, and my children, were inextricably linked with my continuing to be a Protestant, when, moreover, the first affection of my heart had been given to the Anglican Church, and I had for more than twelve years been one of her ministers, and had found unexpected honour and emolument as such—how, I repeat, after all this, I became a Catholic—this, for my own remembrance in future years, if God have such in store for me, and still more for my children who come after me, is the subject of what I am about to write (pp. 1, 2).

The record of these things, now given to the world, is full of every sort of interest. There is the never-dying interest of the struggle of a soul from darkness to light, from light to light. There is the interest of foreign travel—churches, clergy, Catholic people—as it influenced the writer's mind and heart. There are many references to Cardinal Newman, and several letters of his, full of his own characteristics, now for the first time printed. The great names, now so well known, which always appear and re-appear in the history of Anglican conversions during the last forty years, are again brought before us, with fresh traits and new materials—Keble, Ward, Manning, Coleridge, Wilberforce, Gladstone, Palmer, Forbes of Brechin. The volume would be worth securing for the newly-published letters alone. Very interesting to readers of the lately-published instalment of Bishop Wilberforce's *Life* will be found chapter v., entitled "Solution Helped by a Model Anglican Bishop." Mr. Allies was attacked and threatened with prosecution by Bishop Wilberforce for certain doctrinal statements in his well-known "Journal." Several letters passed, and Mr. Allies says:—

The letters of the bishop may be compared with those he wrote to Dr. Hampden. In the one case he appears soft, sleek, and silky, as is seemly in approaching a Queen's nominee; in the other he is prompt and bristling, as a guardsman eager to cut down a rebel who is running amuck. . . . These letters from a man made a bishop by mere Court favour, who, while he denied the Real Presence, assumed the tone of an apostle, made me lose all respect for him. . . . I never could find any solid core of truth in him in his conduct to me (p. 208).

Very well worth reading, too, and very touching, is the account of the writer's interview with Pius IX. at Gaeta, in 1850. Of this audience Bishop Grant wrote, a few days afterwards, to Dr. Wiseman:

"By the way tell Mr. Allies that he must *be quick*, as the Pope spoke about him yesterday. . . . Cardinal Ferretti said that the only night of real freedom from melancholy at Gaeta was after Allies and Wynne had been to see his Holiness. Get him converted *quam primum*" (p. 228). All Catholics will share Mr. Allies's conviction that from the moment of that audience and that blessing the cloud began to dissolve and the daystar to rise.

It ought to be mentioned that, besides matters of graver import, there are numberless good things in the book. As a specimen, take this, attributed to Mr. Ward—he is speaking of the Anglican dignitaries—"If a man be called moderate, or venerable, beware of him; but if both, you may be sure he is a scoundrel" (p. 11).

Biographical Sketch of St. Thomas of Canterbury. By Mrs. WARD.
London: Burns and Oates. 1880.

THIS agreeable volume is a reprint of two articles which have appeared in the DUBLIN REVIEW. They seem to have been in some degree suggested by the crude and illiterate "studies" of Mr. J. A. Froude. They follow Father Morris's well-known "Life and Martyrdom of St. Thomas of Canterbury," and do not, therefore, require us to do more than announce their re-publication. The writer has brought out very successfully both the natural character and the supernatural sanctity of the holy martyr, and her lively and pleasing style, together with her skilful selection from his own letters, although they only present us with a "sketch," nevertheless give that sketch an enduring value.

The Refutation of Darwinism, and the Converse Theory of Development.
By T. WARREN O'NEIL, Member of the Philadelphia Bar.
Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1880.

WITH the single drawback that this book is a little rhetorical, and, if the expression may be used, flippant in its invective, we have here a very useful and even original essay on the shortcomings of Darwinism. Mr. Darwin's facts, allowing for his way of making too much of them, are true, and, being true, must be of the utmost value to true science. Mr. O'Neil accepts his facts, argues that the pet conclusion with which his name is associated is not borne out by them, and then very skilfully shows to what they do really point. Mr. O'Neil considers that all Mr. Darwin's facts prove the law of Reversion, and not the law of Natural Selection. But Reversion points to a multiplicity of different original types. Mr. O'Neil says very well that there is no proof whatever that variations may proceed to an indefinite extent. Yet Mr. Darwin always assumes this throughout. And not only do his facts not prove it—as how could they?—but his repeated admission that the reason, or, as scholastics would call it, the formal cause of the tendency to Variation is totally

undiscoverable, should make him pause before he pronounces that it can proceed without limit. But—and this is the most original point of Mr. O'Neil's book—Mr. Darwin does lay down one law, the law of Reversion, which goes far to invalidate his continual assumption that there is no limit to Variation. Reversion is the principle that lost characters, features, and organs re-appear in the individual under favourable conditions. Almost every character, for instance, which is developed in animals when domesticated, and cared for by man—all those which have been produced by the presence of favourable conditions of growth—were once, in some period past, in a perfect state, and fully developed, in some remote ancestor. Those characters may seem to have been diminished, lessened, or wholly lost, but they were present all the time, in germ, in every individual of the species, and they only required an opportunity to re-appear to the eye. Now Mr. Darwin concedes that all the phenomena of Variation, with an unimportant qualification, may be ranged under the head of Reversion; and, says Mr. O'Neil, there is not a single fact to be found in any of his works, or within the range of physiology, which militates against this view. But if this theory is true, then the theory of unlimited Variation is false. If the theory of Reversion is true, then the number of "species" was fixed by Nature or by God, the assumption of enormous periods of time is unnecessary, and Holy Scripture and popular belief have not been so far mistaken as the men of science would have us believe. It is to be hoped that this book will be read widely. It is most ably written, displays full knowledge of the subject, and places before the reader one view, at least, that we have not met before.

Gleanings of Past Years, 1843-1878. By the Right Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P. In Seven Volumes. London: Murray. 1878.

THESE "Gleanings" are Essays contributed by Mr. Gladstone at various times during the last thirty-six years to various publications of the day. It is characteristic of the author both that he should have thought it worth while to collect and republish them, and that the republication should have been made in these volumes, whose appearance is significant of a railway book-stall, and whose size, of the pocket of a great coat. There is, according to George Herbert, a kind of humility which is "pride in a chain," and Mr. Gladstone possesses no small share of that dubious virtue.

Mr. Gladstone's "Gleanings" fill seven volumes. The first is entitled "The Throne, the Prince Consort, the Cabinet, and Constitution;" the second, "Personal and Literary;" the third, "Historical and Speculative;" the fourth, "Foreign;" the fifth and sixth are denominated "Ecclesiastical;" the seventh is described as "Miscellaneous." Upon the whole we cannot say that we think these books will greatly add to their author's fame, or that they will either delight or profit the bulk of their readers. There are very few review or magazine articles with sufficient body in them to bear republishing.

The effect which most of these compositions of Mr. Gladstone's now produces is as that of the Claret known by his name, after it has been long decanted.

The most interesting of the volumes is, perhaps, the second, which contains articles on Blanco White, Mr. Tennyson, and Lord Macaulay: and, of these three articles, that upon Lord Macaulay is by far the best. It is to that great writer that we owe the justest estimate of Mr. Gladstone's character, in the famous Essay which appeared in the *Edinburgh Review* in 1839, an estimate which his whole subsequent career amply justified. Macaulay's words must have left an enduring smart in a mind so sensitive as Mr. Gladstone's, who, indeed, in one place speaks feelingly of his critic's "scarifying and tomahawking powers"; and it is honourable to him that they do not appear to have affected the impartiality of his judgment. He reckons, indeed, among Lord Macaulay's faults "an occasional tinge of literary vindictiveness," and justly. He points out, too, his want of appreciation of "introspective productions, such as St. Augustine's Confessions; they lay," Mr. Gladstone says, "in a region which he did not frequent, and yet they are among not only the realities, but the deepest and most determining realities of our nature." And Mr. Gladstone goes on to reckon his low estimate of this inward work as betokening an insufficient development of his "powerful mind in this direction." This is true enough. It is true, too, that Macaulay's standard for judging of all things human and divine with which he dealt was that afforded by the Whigism of the early nineteenth century; or, as Mr. Gladstone grandiosely puts it, "the higher energies of his nature were summed up in the present." Nor can an impartial critic deny that while "the serious flaw in Macaulay's mind was want of depth;" "the central defect with which his productions appear to be chargeable is a pervading strain of more or less exaggeration;" that he is unjust and hasty in his judgments, and that "a nearly uniform refusal to accept correction may be charged against him." On the other hand, Mr. Gladstone does full justice to his "marvellous accuracy in matters of concrete fact," his "luminous views of single 'objects,' his 'great knowledge, great diligence, great uprightness and kindliness,' his 'consistency,' his 'incapacity for intentional unfairness,' his 'powerful fancy,' 'high standard of excellence in style and unwearied labour to come up to it,' his 'generous love of talent, and the soundness of the aim and basis of his work.'" But let us quote the concluding passage of this Essay of Mr. Gladstone's: it is a fair summing up of the matter and a good specimen of his best work.

Macaulay must and will survive. Whether he will subsist as a standard and supreme authority, is another question. Wherever and whenever read, he will be read with fascination, with delight, with wonder; and with copious instruction too; but also with copious reserve, with questioning scrutiny, with liberty to reject, and with much exercise of that liberty. The contemporary mind may in rare cases be taken by storm; but posterity, never. The tribunal of the present is accessible to influence; that of the future is incorrupt. The coming generations will not give Macaulay up; but they will, probably, attach much less value than we have done to his

ipse dixit. They will hardly accept from him his net solutions of literary, and still less of historic problems. Yet they will obtain from his marked and telling points of view great aid in solving them. We sometimes fancy that ere long there will be editions of his work in which readers may be saved from pitfalls by brief, respectful, and judicious commentary, and that his great achievements may be at once commemorated and corrected by men of slower pace, of drier light, and of more tranquil, broadset, and comprehensive judgment; for his works are in many respects among the prodigies of literature; in some, they have never been surpassed. As lights that have shone through the whole universe of letters, they have made their title to a place in the solid firmament of fame. But the tree is greater and better than its fruit, and greater and better yet than the works themselves are the lofty aims and conceptions, the large heart, the independent, manful mind, the pure and noble career, which in this biography have disclosed to us the true figure of the man who wrote them (p. 341).

Kalendarium manuale utriusque ecclesie orientalis et occidentalis, academis clericorum accommodatum. Auctore NICOLAO NILLES, S. J. in Universitate Cœnipontana professore. Cœniponte, ex officina Feliciani Rauch. 1879.

F. NILLES has here given us a work not only full of wide and deep learning, but also in a high degree useful and appropriate. Written principally for his own classes, it meets the wants of all Catholic scholars throughout the world. Eastern Christians united with the Holy See are peculiarly indebted to him. The book owes its origin to the circumstance that a good many seminarists belonging to the several Oriental rites are devoting themselves under the direction of F. Nilles to liturgical study. Moreover, he has erected in Innspruck a "heortological" seminary where the abstract rules of the "Computus Ecclesiasticus" are adapted to real cases, and the student learns how to arrange the feasts throughout the year. Such an institution is useful in any Seminary. In Austria it is for special reasons indispensable. There are in the Austro-Hungarian Empire about seven millions of Eastern Christians, four millions of whom are Roman Catholics. Our author in publishing this book means to teach disciples who belong to the Oriental rites how to overcome many difficulties necessarily arising from this diversity in the celebration of the Church's feasts. Hence it is dedicated to the Bishops of the Eastern Uniate rites. F. Nilles piously entertains the hope that a good many priests or laymen who unhappily live separated from the centre of unity may make use of it, and hence we have large quotations from those Greek fathers who testify to the Primacy of the Holy See and the Infallibility of St. Peter's successors.

The *Kalendarium* is made up of the following parts. After quoting those decrees in which the Popes express their intention of maintaining the venerable Eastern rites, our author goes on to give a general survey of the Eastern Churches in Austro-Hungary. This is followed by ample explanations of the Eastern liturgical books, as: *μηνολόγιον*.

τυπικὸν, τριώδιον, ἀνθολόγιον, ὠρολόγιον, ὁκτώηχος, παρακλητικὴ καὶ ψαλτήριον, and by a learned interpretation of those terms, which is necessary for the understanding of the liturgical books. Then we have the *Kalendarium*, or *εὐρολόγιον*, in Greek and Latin.

The main body of the book contains an excellent and instructive commentary on the Eastern *Kalendarium*, for which the author has been highly praised in Germany. To many scholars he may be considered as having opened out a new world. His thorough knowledge of English, German, and Oriental literature, his masterly grasp of every matter connected with his purpose, and the extensive quotations from the Pontifical decrees, testify to the author's learning and piety. But what we would especially point out for observation is the convincing testimony, on the part of the Greek Church, to the Primacy and Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff, here so well brought out.

The "*Kalendarium Occidentalis Ecclesiæ*" is less well done. The concluding part contains the *Kalendars* of the Ruthenian, Armenian, Syriac, Malchite, and Servian Catholics, followed by a treatise on the time-signs in the Martyrology, two excellent indices, and a map of the Eastern Church. Only one matter might perhaps be found fault with. F. Nilles treats only of the "*festa immobilia*." We fail to see why he reserved the moveable feasts for a second volume, and much more why this important circumstance was not plainly stated on the title-page. But, allowing for this defect, we cannot but earnestly recommend to every Catholic seminary this standard work. The second Part is eagerly expected by every lover of the venerable and impressive rites of the Church.

Benedicti PP. XIV., olim Prosperi Cardinalis de Lambertinis de Sacrosancto Sacrificio Missæ libri tres. Juxta editiones Patavinam (1745), Augustanam (1752), Venetam (1797), et Pratensem (1843), denuo edidit et multis annotationibus et additionibus auxit P. JOSEPHUS SCHNEIDER, S.J. Moguntiæ: Kirchheim. 1879.

AMONGST the Sovereign Pontiffs since the Council of Trent, there is perhaps none to be compared to Benedict XIV., either as a canonist or a theologian. All his works are standard writings, but no one of them is so familiar to the clergy, and especially to priests occupied in missionary work, as his treatise on the Holy Sacrifice. Of its intrinsic merits we need not say one word; it is beyond all praise. What we are concerned with here is the new edition of the work by Father Schneider. Former editions being nearly exhausted, a new and accurate one was eagerly looked for in almost every Catholic country. No fitter person could have been selected for the work than the present editor, well known as he is in Europe, America, and Australia by his excellent "*Manuale Sacerdotum*." He has not only given us a most accurate text, but has enriched the book with many recent decisions of the Roman Congregations bearing on ritual. Take for example page 16, where he treats in his notes the cases in which altars lose

their consecration, or page 53 where he enumerates the cases where the use of the stole is allowed. Besides these valuable additions we find two instructive *indices*, one containing every work consulted by the Pontiff, and an index rerum.

The Historians of the Church of York and its Archbishops. Edited by JAMES RAINE, M.A., Canon of York. Vol. I. London, 1879. (Rolls Series.)

CANON RAINE has set his hand to a good work, of which the present volume is a long-expected first instalment. Twenty-three years ago a Collection of "The Historians of the Church of York; with an Appendix of Illustrative Documents" appeared in the list of projected publications of the Surtees Society. The proposal dropped out of the Surtees' list, after the Report of 1870, only to reappear, in 1872, in the Rolls Series, as "*Corpus Historicum Eboracense*," to include the "Documents Relating to the Primacy of York." The work at length comes out under the title given at the head of this notice. The change of name does not imply, it is to be hoped, that the editor is, by some official ruling, to confine his labours to bare biographical and strictly historical material. Among the most welcome features of Canon Raine's editing is the wealth of illustration embodied in his notes, and drawn largely from the Archives of the Northern Sees. The plan of the Rolls Series, for the most part, excludes such annotations; but we trust that, as this collection proceeds, it may be enriched with appendices of York documents (of which no one has so extensive and minute an acquaintance as Canon Raine), not as amply, perhaps, yet somewhat in the same way, as the Durham Historians, prepared for the Surtees Society by its venerated founder.

The volume with which we are now concerned comprises the various lives of St. Wilfrid; the lives and miracles of St. John of Beverley; Alcuin's Poem on the Archbishop and Saints of the Church of York; lastly (and most valuable of all), the first part of the documents which group round St. Oswald the Archbishop, in the shape of the hitherto inedited contemporary life, the source from which later writers, like the Ramsey historian and Eadmer, have drawn their information. It is by no means creditable to English scholars that a piece of such primary importance for the history of the tenth century should have so long remained in manuscript only. Apart from the mere advantage in accuracy of statement, which must be presupposed in favour of an eye-witness as against a compiler, there is something more valuable, more instructive still, in a contemporary narrative; it is—it cannot but be—a reflex, in some measure, of the period; whether a man will, or whether he will not, he must write, if at all, under the influence of his own times and of his own surroundings. The mode of presentment, the turns of expression, the reticences, are so many involuntary revelations of the life, the ideas, the tendencies, of the day. The case in point is no exception to the rule.

St. Oswald does not possess, either in his personal character or his

career, the interest which is excited by his great contemporaries and associates, St. Dunstan of Canterbury and St. Ethelwold of Winchester. He has neither the initiative of the one, nor the energy of the other. In the recoil from the false and unjust conception of Dunstan's career, so long in vogue, there seems, in the present day, a tendency to adopt a view which, though more generous, is still misleading. Hatred of the monk-blinded writers—now happily, half-forgotten (and some whose labours still deserve recognition)—to the merits of the statesman and the greatness of the man. Now, with a truer appreciation of his career as a Minister of State (if we may use the word), it is becoming the fashion to extenuate his position in regard to the monastic reform of his day, and to minimize his ecclesiastical influence.

The actual reformer and promoter of the reform is no longer Dunstan, but Ethelwold, who bids fair, by-and-by, to inherit the reversion of St. Dunstan's old reputation as a harsh and intemperate zealot.

The character of both we have to seek, it is true, in a general view of their public action; but the development of each, and its contrasts, are marked also with unstudied touches in the reports of those who knew them both,—reports where we look in vain for evidence of the newly-imagined laxity of Dunstan's observance. In St. Dunstan the monastic vocation is innate; though it was probably affected, it was not suggested, by the Winchester traditions, which may be traced back to St. Grimbald. It was a living and active force within him long before Dunstan came under the care of his relative, the Bishop of Winchester. The young day-dreams of a strong nature have a tendency to realize themselves in later life; and the boyish vision, in his school days, of a renovated Glastonbury—the outer shrine of a new monastic spirit—shews the workings of a mind influenced, but prepared to be influenced, by the past memories and the present desecration of the holy place. These early imaginings did not pass away in view of the brilliant prospects opening before the young cleric, who had all the advantages of personal capacity and powerful connections. The easy-going discipline of Bishop Elphege (the first) of Winchester, his relative and tutor, and himself a monk, did not long satisfy Dunstan's aspirations; and he betakes himself to retirement, in Glastonbury, to work out the realization of his monastic ideal. He builds, it is true, but only with the essentially practical end of securing the primary requirement of monastic enclosure; the buildings were just like those, it is said (Dunstan himself may be taken as the authority for the tale), which he dreamed of in his boyhood. The care of the temporal business and of the estates of the house would naturally fall on him as abbot; but herein he takes a course which indicated his appreciation of the work incumbent on him individually—the work he, of all men, is called to do. He throws all such worldly concerns on a trusty layman, his brother Wulfric, so that he, no less than his disciples, may be able to keep within the monastic precincts, and, that free from the incumbrance of external affairs, he may be, in his own person, an example to them in all things of the life to which their profession had bound them. In later years, and in

the decline of age, and grown grey in the cares of Church and State, he shews the same solicitude for the reform of which, from the first, he had been the life and soul, and he still continues to go his rounds of visiting the newly established monasteries "for the building up of souls," says his biographer.

The action of St. Dunstan, as supreme in Edgar's counsels, and in the height of his power, is not less significant. Glastonbury, under his care, had been the destined seed-plot of rulers in the Church; now came the transplanting; and men of the new school (in the cases of which there is distinct record, all young men) were put in possession of the principal Sees of England. Nor was the policy thus inaugurated laid aside in process of time, as the records of nearly every English bishopric bear witness. The appointment of Elphege (later, the martyr of Canterbury) to Winchester, on St. Ethelwold's death, shews the settled lines of Dunstan's ecclesiastical administration. He may not figure prominently in the arrangement of details, but he does not withdraw his hand from the direction.

Ethelwold nowhere gives indication of the originality and independence which mark Dunstan. On entering the road of a more strict perfection, though equal in age and birth, he recognizes at once the true and natural relation of their differing characters, and without reserve he commits himself to the rule, the guidance, the direction of Dunstan, but lately his friend and co-disciple at Winchester, a submission which was continued to the very last days of his life. Whilst Dunstan, the abbot, is intent on the sum and kernel of monastic observance and on the cultivation of the spiritual field, Ethelwold, kindly of heart and gentle of soul, busies himself, though constituted monastic dean, in garden work for the commodities of the brethren: the fruit and vegetables at the daily meal are of his planting and tending. How unlike anything recorded of Dunstan is that picture left us of St. Ethelwold gathering the young about him, as a sweet solace of his episcopal cares, and teaching them to render, in their mother tongue, the Latin books of the learned. The different spirit of the two great chiefs of the tenth-century ecclesiastical movement in England is faithfully reflected in their biographies. In St. Dunstan we catch a glimpse of the practical mind which, knowing its end and how to reach it, brushes aside all that is superfluous and unnecessary. In Ethelwold there is an appreciation of the outer trappings (so to speak) of the monastic life which Dunstan, in the spirit of a true reformer on that ground, seems to have held almost in contempt. In the details which Dunstan passed by, Ethelwold was thoroughly at home. Building and planting he loved for building and planting's sake. He went round about the works and himself superintended their progress. In the literary memorials that proceed from his school, the same tone of mind is observable. With an evident pleasure they linger over the new churches, their form and disposition, their towers and doorways, their ornaments and fittings, and the church stuff, the monastery and its fishponds contrived within its walls. Ethelwold entered into the pomp and circumstance of the great renewal, and no one could be

more fitted than he to raise up again, from their desolation, Peterborough and Ely, Abingdon and Thorney; or to bring into the great ancient cathedral churches, in place of the clerical life there prevailing, a monastic observance which should pave the way for a restoration of their exterior splendour.

But to make Ethelwold the prime mover is to put in place of the principal, the agent. St. Dunstan initiates the reform, he trains his agents, he places them in posts of authority where they may act with freedom and effect; in a word, in the beginning he is the inspirer—to the end he remains the master-mind of the movement.

The position of St. Oswald is somewhat between these two; having resolved on the monastic state he has neither the self-reliance of St. Dunstan or the submissive and unquestioning confidence of St. Ethelwold; but, as a middle course, he seeks, beyond the sea, a safe school of discipline in a house of established repute. Returned home and made a bishop by Dunstan's influence, he imitates, in sober measure, and with a certain astute prudence, the proceedings of Ethelwold in building, restoring, propagating. The biographer seems to have recognized the peculiarities of Oswald's character; as he proceeds with his work the great and powerful Ethelwin, Ealdorman (or viceroy, we might say) of East Anglia, Oswald's friend and intimate, and co-founder with him of Ramsey Abbey, becomes as much the hero of the narrative as Oswald himself.

This "Life," now first published, is divided into six parts: the first deals with St. Oswald's family and descent; the second, with his monastic vocation and life at Fleury; the third, with his elevation to the episcopate, and the measures he took to plant new monasteries; the fourth is mainly concerned with the public history of Edgar's reign, and the time immediately following; the fifth, with Oswald at York and Ripon, and with St. Dunstan (nothing new); it gives, moreover, a noteworthy account of the death of Brihtnoth in Maldon fight; the sixth part is devoted to the completion of the great foundation of Ethelwin and Oswald at Ramsey, and the last days and death of the two friends.

The fourth part is a contribution of the highest value and importance to our knowledge of the time, particularly in all that concerns the reaction against the monks that ensued on the death of King Edgar, and the troubles which centre round King Edward the Martyr. The writer often uses vague terms where we should desire precise details; but he had lived through the events, and his fervour and earnestness show that, in recalling them, though years had since passed by, he writes as if still under the influence of those days of dread and danger to men of his habit. The monks, at least in Mercia, were literally turned out of house and home, and reduced to wander over the face of the land; they became a by-word and objects of scorn to the populace. "There breathed out among the Christian people a spirit of very madness, as in Judea, long ago, when they persecuted our Lord Himself in that deed of iniquity when the dull head of Caiphas set itself up, and the *apostolicus vir* became a vile apostate,

and wicked Pilate spoke to Thee (and) the disciples stood full of fear as in these days do the monks full of grief. But this the spirit of Ethelwin, just and upright, could not brook. The hosts assembled, a worthy company, and himself becomes the leader of the array, and the Prince of the Angels guarded and comforted him" (p. 445). Do these words really stand, and stand only, for what they seem to be—an allusion to the Gospel story? Or, under cover of such a parallel, does the writer intend to hint at persons and circumstances he found it not prudent to indicate more exactly? What was the precise attitude taken up at this juncture by the chief men of the day is not to be made out with clearness from the scanty memorials which remain. Did Dunstan (the undoubted *apostolicus vir*, in a passage further on, p. 456) then fail? Did Oswald, the timid, the solicitous, now appear before his time (cp. pp. 470 and 447) as an Angel of Light? Was it that at a critical moment Dunstan was silent, and men, in the excitement of their own fears, misinterpreted his reserve and misdoubted his firmness—forgot the teaching of his whole past history, that he was strong enough to bide his time, and that neither clamour or menace could turn him from his purpose? It seems, however, clear, that in the strong arm of powerful laymen the monks found their immediate protection. First among these were Ethelwin and Alfwold, both sons of the great Duke Ethelstan, *semirrex*, as he was called by high and low, on account of his predominant authority in the realm, who ended his days as a monk at Glastonbury. Whether or not Alfwold actually used in the great assembly the very words attributed to him, it may be taken for certain that they represent correctly enough the ideas of those who took that side of the question. "If Christ still grants me life and health" (he is reported to have said) "those things which are my own I will keep [the free disposal of], and I will give them to whom it so please me; and by Him who regenerated me I will not suffer men of religion, by whose prayers we may be delivered from our enemies, to be expelled from our bounds" (p. 445). The interests of the monks, of course, were at stake, but it happened that with those interests were bound up the rights or the privileges of personages of another quality.

If the fourth part of this biography is historically the most important, the sixth is, certainly, not of less personal and social interest. It is a picture drawn from the life; and Ethelwin, the subject of it, is the last link that connected the new generation with the race of great men, whose heyday was in the glorious times of King Edgar. This chapter betrays, too, a certain sense of artistic effect, and is disposed not without some literary skill; in execution it may be somewhat rude and cumbered, but the intention can be divined; what is more, it is marked, here and there, by touches of genuine feeling.

It opens with a description of the great festival which signalized the completion of the Abbey of Ramsey. The writer brings before us the crowd of prelates and nobles—conspicuous among them the two venerable founders—of abbots, thanes, and people; the sounding horn which summons the multitude to take their part in the rejoicings of the day;

the rich adornments of the place; the pealing organ, the sweet voices of the singers. The solemn service was followed by a great banquet, and Oswald was *jocundissimus conviva*, we are told elsewhere. The next day the privileges and liberties of the house were confirmed in a full assembly, and then, the next, after blessing the monks and humbly receiving their blessing in return, the aged prelate takes his leave, never to see them more. Ethelwin cannot separate himself thus from the monastery, the completion of which he had desired with great desire to see. Early in Lent, accompanied by his two sons, Edwin and Ethelwerd, with a few attendants, he came back to Ramsey. It was just before *Oculi mei* Sunday (the third in Lent). The three days thereafter he spent in great need of soul, having the hour of his death, as it were, before his eyes. On the Wednesday morning, after Mass, he went, wholly wrapped up in devotion, to the altar of Christ and St. Benedict, as to a sure defence. For St. Benedict he loved above all the rest of the Saints, and he held in honour whatever he had seen of that Order. He remained before the altar, weeping and prostrate, a son on either side, and these two were sorely grieved to see their father's tears, whilst the community assembled round sang the Penitential Psalms. After which he received absolution from a trusted friend of St. Oswald for more than thirty years, the monk Germanus, whom he entreated not to leave him henceforward to the end of his days. Rising up from the ground, and resting on his staff, he now spoke to the brethren many affectionate words, and bid his sons there present be ever faithful defenders of the house. Then he admitted every one to the kiss of peace, saying, "The Lord bless you from Sion;" and now addressing the monks in consoling terms, he again gave the man old man's blessing, commended himself to their prayers, and wished them ever prosperous and happy days whom, in the past, he had loved and cherished so well. That night strange sounds were heard within and without the precincts of the monastery, as though the church were coming down; another saw, in his dreams, the towers falling; and the brethren discoursed with each other what these portents should mean. They had not long to wait for the meaning, for about complin time* a messenger arrived

* On Thursday, 3 March, 992. The words *post profectioem*, p. 469, must not be taken too literally, and it seems clear that the visit of Ethelwin to Ramsey, mentioned, pp. 467-8, is one and the same with that at p. 474. According to Florence of Worcester (vol. i. p. 149, Ed. Engl. Hist. Soc.), the dedication of Ramsey took place in 991, in which he is supported by a passage in the Life (p. 467), *veniensque domi tribus mensibus mansit* (Oswaldus) *incolumis*—i.e., after the dedication on 8th November. Oswald and Ethelwin both died in 992 (A. S. C. sub anno). In the earlier passage of the Life, it is stated (p. 467) that one of the few days Ethelwin then spent at Ramsey, was the 3rd Sunday in Lent, from the later passage, p. 474, it is clear that the news of Oswald's death came to Ramsey while Ethelwin was staying there. Now St. Oswald died 29th February, 992, which fell precisely on the Monday after the third Sunday in Lent. The news coming round by Worcester to Ramsey, reached Ethelwin's ears before his departure, on the evening of the Thursday, as appears from the sequence of the narrative which is taken up at p. 474, from the point where it was left off, at p. 469. Florence is wrong in saying the dedication was *feria tertia*; 8th November, 991, fell on a Sunday. The Vita (p. 475), and the Ramsey records (Monast. Angl.

from the monks of Worcester, whither word had come straight from York, to say that Oswald was dead. Some one broke the news suddenly to Ethelwin; the old man burst into tears, and, ill and infirm as he was, he rose up and went at once to the church and made no delay in rendering his service of affection and piety. From that time forth the smile of gladness was never seen on his lips; no word or sign of joy, or jest escaped him. A settled grief was now added to increasing pain and weakness. Yet, for all this, he did not forget the duties his station imposed on him in regard to the King and the public weal. So he returned to Winchester,* for his counsels were both acceptable and salutary. Notwithstanding the feebleness of his bodily state, he was ready, in heart and mind, to die, if Christ so willed it, for the welfare of his countrymen. But his infirmities now grew upon him fast, and the end was at hand. He made his confession, was anointed, and received Holy Communion, and then begged those who were about him in this ministry—namely, Bishop Elphege, later the martyr of Canterbury, and his monks, with Germanus who had come with him from Ramsey—to sing with him and for him the psalms which he had by heart. But first, mindful of the needs of his household, he dismissed them, bidding them go into the hall and there spend a merry day, for it was Sunday. Then he and those around him went on singing; when they came to the last psalm of the psalter *Laudate Dominum in cymbalis*, he repeated thrice the final words *omnis spiritus laudet Dominum*; with his right hand signed himself with the sign of the Cross; with his left closed his own eyes, and thus, with the sign of faith and with the praises of God on his lips, he entered into the rest of the saints, and was admitted, we may well believe, into the company of the citizens of Paradise. With much honour they carried the body of the dead prince to Ramsey, and they buried him in the place which, in his lifetime, he had loved so much.

This life abounds with illustrations of contemporary manners and incidental notices of the most varied kinds; it throws light especially on several liturgical observances. Here it may be sufficient to mention (though the choice among so much that is interesting is not easy) the very full description of King Edgar's coronation (pp. 436-8); the finding of the relics of St. Wilfrid (p. 447); the blessed bread partaken of before meals (pp. 454-5); Oswald's love of spring-time is a rare and characteristic touch (p. 461); the custom of carrying relics in

vol. i. p. 231., ed. 1655), again agree as to the date of Ethelwin's death, which happened, according to the former, on a Sunday, according to the latter, on 8 Cal. Maii; the 24th April, in 992, fell on the fourth Sunday after Easter.

* The indications of the contemporary life are here followed in preference to the statements of the "*Historia Ramesiensis*" (in Gale's xv. Scr. p. 428), which, if definite, are certainly sometimes wrong. The credit hitherto allowed to this Ramsey History is greatly shaken by the publication of the "*Life*." The account of Ethelwin's last days, for instance, is less a version than a perversion, and a perversion spoilt by the author's gratuitous inventions. The whole tone and character is distorted and lost. A collected and critical edition of the historical memorials of Ramsey (as also of Peterborough and Glastonbury), is an addition to the Rolls Series much to be desired.

the Rogation processions (p. 447); pp. 410-11 and 424-5 are valuable notices of the life in the monasteries before and after the reform; p. 454 is a description of the city of York, which, it is said, then had thirty thousand *adult* inhabitants; the account of the great Council about the monks (pp. 425-7) is written in a strain which suggests that it may be a version or adaptation of some lost metrical piece on the event, similar to those preserved in the Saxon Chronicle, and elsewhere.

A few slips on the editor's part does not detract from the carefulness which characterizes his work as a whole. The unintelligible words "*ad regulum electus*" (p. 421) should read "*ad regimen electus*" (so the MS.); *largitur* (p. 463, l. 1) is a misprint for *largiter*" (so MS.); "*quid erat perendie*" (p. 470) of the MS., is probably correct instead of the *erit* of the print; such slips of the pen (which may certainly be laid to the account of the scribe, not the author) as "*castris*" (for *castri*), and "*impositis*" (for *imposito*) (pp. 413 and 450) should surely be corrected in the editor's text. *Sacerdotale officium* (p. 470) here means St. Oswald's *Episcopate*, not the years of his *priesthood* (as in margin). The narrative (p. 458) has nothing to do with Christ Church at Canterbury, but (as appears on a comparison with the parallel passage in the life of St. Dunstan) refers to a chapel of the Blessed Virgin to the east of the Abbey Church of St. Augustine. It may be added that the MS. of Frithegode, from which Mabillon printed, did not belong to the "German Monastery of Corbei" (Preface p. xl. and p. xlii.), but "Bibliothecæ Corbeiensi in Gallia," the library of Old Corbie in Picardy, one of the most venerable sanctuaries in Christendom, the remains of which still dominate the plain a few miles north-east of Amiens. The late Sir T. D. Hardy's conjecture (cp. preface p. lxvi.) that the author is probably a foreigner deserves entire reconsideration. The Philipps M.S., No. 13,560, at Cheltenham, is a Life of St. Wilfrid: is it Eadmer, or the missing Salisbury MS. of Eddius? (see Preface, p. xxxviii).

Il Cimitero di S. Agnese sulla Via Nomentana, descritto ed illustrato da
 MARIANO ARMELLINI. Roma. Tipografia Polyglotta della S. C. di
 Propaganda Fide. 1879.

HERE is another valuable work from the pen of one of De Rossi's disciples. He follows more immediately in the wake of his master, both as to his choice of subject and the manner of treating it, than M. Le Blant; and, being a much younger man, does not bring to the execution of his task the same amount of experience and learning. This is not, however, the first work of Signor Armellini's, and we hope it will not be the last. He is gratefully mentioned in more than one passage of De Rossi's volumes, as having, by his perseverance and extraordinary keenness of vision, succeeded in deciphering inscriptions which had baffled the weary eyes of his master. Indeed, his first work "*Scoperta della Cripta di S. Emerenziana e di una Memoria relativa alla Cattedra di San Pietro nel Cimitero Ostiano,*"

owes its origin to a discovery of this kind; and now he has devoted himself to a thorough examination of the neighbouring and sister-cemetery (as we may justly call it) of St. Agnes.

Our readers are doubtless already well aware that it is now an acknowledged fact among all Roman archæologists that what used to be called, in Father Marchi's days (forty years ago), the Catacomb of St. Agnes, was not really entitled to that name. It was the *Cemeterium Ostrianum* in which St. Peter had baptized, and where his chair had once been venerated. The real Cemetery of St. Agnes was in immediate connection with the Basilica of that Saint, more than a quarter of a mile nearer to Rome. It was always known that there were subterranean galleries there, full of graves; but it was thought that these were only distant branches of the Catacomb on which Father Marchi spent so many years of labour. This error was, of course, entirely dissipated as soon as De Rossi's invaluable discoveries had established the principle on which these earliest Basilicas were built—viz., as near as possible to the grave of the martyr whom it was desired to honour. Thanks to the impulse given to this branch of archæological research by those discoveries, the Canons Regulars to whom the Basilica of St. Agnes belongs, have prosecuted the work of excavation with unremitting perseverance for some years past; every gallery has been explored, every fragment of ornament or inscription carefully examined, and the whole faithfully registered. It is the result of this labour which Mariano Armellini has here given to the public, illustrated, from time to time, by the discussion of more general subjects which the history suggests. In most of these discussions our author follows, without hesitation, the lines long since laid down by De Rossi; and where he departs from these, because the questions are new and he has not the benefit of such sure guidance, we are not certain that we always agree with him. Nevertheless, we are sincerely grateful to him for his important contributions to our knowledge of Roma Sotterranea.

We consider that he has satisfactorily demonstrated that the Cemetery which he describes originally consisted of four distinct *areae*. One of these was the private property of St. Agnes' family; a plot of ground of very limited extent (45 metres by 30), and she was herself one of the last to be buried in it. We read in her Acts that her parents buried her in an *agellus* which belonged to them; and *agellus* is the very word used in more than one Pagan monument to denote the area devoted to the sepulture of some particular family and its dependents. Signor Armellini hazards a conjecture that this particular burial-place belonged to the Gens Clodia; and consequently that the young Saint herself was a member of that family; and certainly many independent arguments seem to give probability to this conjecture. But, however this may be, it is placed beyond all reasonable doubt that this first nucleus of the Catacomb was in use from the very earliest ages of Christianity, and that in it were buried, besides the members of the family to whom it belonged, many other Christians, including both slaves and freedmen "of the house of Cæsar." De Rossi had long

since pointed out a large number of epitaphs from the neighbouring Cœmeterium Ostrianum, of most ancient type, cut in marble, in letters of beautifully classical form, and having many characteristics which oblige us to refer them, if not to the age of those who heard the Apostles themselves, yet certainly of their immediate successors, and now, in this Cemetery of St. Agnes, are found many more of the same class, and still *in situ*; and among the names of the persons thus commemorated are Crescens, Epaphras, Eunice, Epaphroditus, Narcissus, Phœbe, and Alexander—all names occurring in the Epistles of St. Paul. Of this original area there are not more than eight or ten galleries and three or four *cubicula*, remaining; they contain, however, nearly a thousand skeletons still undisturbed in their first resting-places.

Other galleries have been destroyed or rendered inaccessible by the building of the grand Constantinian Basilica, in which, according to the usual practice, the principal altar was placed over the martyr's tomb. Signor Armellini has crept along the subterranean galleries up to the very tomb itself, and ascertained that there still remain many graves untouched in its immediate neighbourhood.

At no great distance from this area, but independent of it, was formed another much smaller Cemetery in the outskirts of a sand-pit. Then, in the latter half of the third century, the burial of the martyr St. Agnes on the confines of the original area was the reason of forming a larger cemetery between the first and the Cœmeterium Ostrianum; its galleries pass and re-pass under the present Via Nomentana, not penetrating, however, beyond the old road of the same name, which lay further to the right. This area received further extension not long before the conversion of Constantine. Towards the end of that century, a fourth subterranean burial-place was formed in immediate connection with certain Pagan *Columbaria*, not far from the Mausoleum of Santa Costanza, and now having actual communication with it. This last item is of considerable importance, as it serves to explain the only *facts* on which Mr. Parker has raised his monstrous theory as to the Roman Catacombs having been used by Christians and Pagans indiscriminately for purposes of burial. This connection between a *columbarium* and a part of the Cemetery of St. Agnes is one of his favourite instances by which he seeks to support his untenable proposition; indeed, we might almost say that it is the only one which is at all correctly stated in his pages. But, when we come to learn the real date of this part of the Christian Cemetery, it loses all value for Mr. Parker's purpose, since it is obvious that the families to which these *Columbaria* belonged may, by this time, have become Christian.

Of the four areas which go to make up the Cemetery of St. Agnes, the two latest are much the more extensive, as one would naturally expect. Out of the 5753 graves which Signor Armellini has counted in all, the two last contain more than 4000, and 700 of these are untouched. This is a notable peculiarity of this whole Cemetery, that it has not been so thoroughly plundered as most others. Our readers must remember, however, that we are only speaking comparatively. Every page of the work before us is full of lamentation over the ruthless

ruin that the Cemetery has suffered at the hands of the ignorant and greedy spoilers. Still it is something to be able to reckon within so small a compass 860 untouched graves, and to read about 50 inscriptions that were scratched in the fresh mortar, and 250 engraved on marble. The synoptical tables in which our author has summed up some of the statistics of his subject are not the least valuable or interesting portion of his work—*e.g.*, in the first area he finds one example of a monogram (of late insertion, of course), and no other instance of the cross in any form whatever; in the second, 22 monograms and 6 other crosses; in the third, 90 monograms and 15 crosses; in the latest, 25 monograms and 3 crosses. It may also interest some persons who are fond of statistics, to learn that the proportion of adults to infants and very young children buried in these Catacombs is something less than 67 to 27; and that about $22\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the graves have some kind of inscription, written on the tiles, or engraved in marble. Again, of the grave-stones in the first area, scarcely one in ten has any inscription, and this invariably of the briefest and simplest kind, a name without a title, or a date, or an aspiration; and throughout the whole extent, one only grave is marked by any little object fastened into the mortar for purposes of identification. In those parts of the Cemetery, on the contrary, which are later than Constantine, at least one grave in ten is so marked, most commonly by little rings of bone, but also by coins, shells, buttons, bits of glass or enamel, and other trifling objects; of glass vessels and of lamps, only a single specimen of each belongs to the first area; in the second, twenty glasses have been found and a dozen lamps; in the third, a hundred and forty glasses and nearly a hundred lamps; in the fourth, forty and twenty respectively.

It is the abundance and minuteness of such details as these which give its special value to Signor Armellini's work; and we hope that he may be induced to undertake the same task for others, suburban Catacombs. We would only suggest to him and to others, his fellow-workers in this extensive field of labour, that there is no necessity for filling any portion of their pages with a *rechauffé* of De Rossi's dissertations. These have attained a world-wide celebrity, and a knowledge of them may be taken for granted in all who will care to read these supplementary volumes. To repeat them adds greatly to the cost of the volumes, and little or nothing to their value. We should hail the advent of any number of auxiliaries in the field of Roman Christian Archaeology who will work with the same zeal as Signor Armellini, and record what they see with the same fidelity and intelligence; only do not let them think it necessary to review, at every turn, the position of the main body of the army and recount its victories.

The third and last part of Signor Armellini's work is taken up with an account of the Cemetery, which was made here, as at San Callisto, above ground, around the Mausoleum of Santa Costanza, the Christian origin of which building he places beyond all doubt.

J. S. N.

Historical Portraits of the Tudor Dynasty and the Reformation Period.

By S. HUBERT BURKE, Author of "The Men and Women of the Reformation." Vol. I. John Hodges. London, 1879.

A VALUABLE addition has been made to the too scanty stock of reliable works on the English Reformation, by this, the first instalment of Mr. Hubert Burke's "Historical Portraits of the Tudor Dynasty." We say a valuable addition, because the author, already favourably known to the Catholic public, has given us in an agreeably written and handsome volume the result of many years' labour and research in our National Archives. Mr. Burke's aim has been to arrive at the truth concerning the characters and events of which he treats, by consulting, wherever such a course was possible, the original documents, and by allowing due weight to the opinions and judgments of those who were contemporary with the chief men and women of the Reformation. It is needless to say that the result puts before us a very different picture from that which is usually given; and it is significant that the authorities quoted, whose united testimony goes to form this picture, as favourable to the Catholic side as it is unfavourable to their adversaries, belong, for the most part, to the adversaries themselves. Indeed, we do not hesitate to express our frank opinion that Mr. Burke, in his determination to be impartial, has not allowed full measure of credit to the early Catholic historians of the Reformation period. We allude, in particular, to the decided, and, it seems to us unwarranted animus shown to the reputation of Sander, of whom it is surely unfair to say that his "reputation for truth is on a par with that of John Foxe," (p. 92), seeing that, of late years, the discovery of contemporary and corroborative evidence has raised the reputation of Sander from the unmerited obloquy which had so long overlain it. If proof of our words is needed we need only refer to Mr. Lewis's "Introduction and Notes to Sander's Rise and Growth of the English Schism." The grounds, apparently, of Mr. Burke's low estimate of Sander's veracity, are the statements which that writer makes (in common, as we now know, with many others both English and foreign), concerning the relationship existing between Henry VIII. and Anne Boleyn. This is not the place, nor have we at present space to go into the question with the fulness which it requires, but we must express our regret that, in a controversy of so important a nature, Mr. Burke has not been at more pains to favour us with exact references to his authorities. Indeed the one fault which we have to find with this volume, and the one feature wherein it so manifestly is inferior to Audin's "Life of Henry VIII.," (a work dealing with the same materials, and with which it provokes comparison), is the absence of references. Thus, in the controversy about the early life of Anne Boleyn, a schoolfellow of hers "who afterwards became an Abbess," is quoted as a witness to the irreproachable life led by Anne before her introduction to the English Court (p. 93). The evidence would be valuable if we were aware of the source whence Mr. Burke derived it. Vague statements like the above interfere with the historical value of the work, and it is not by such means that our author can overthrow a warmly-defended opinion, like that which we

find quaintly expressed in a rare French work of 1644, where, of Henry VIII. we are told, "D'ailleurs, le Roy aymoit eperduëment Anne de Bolen, que l'on croyoit toutefois communement estre sa fille."*

Another instance where, for want of references, we are forced to regret Mr. Burke's statements, occurs at p. 298; in which place, speaking of the suppression of the English monasteries, he says, "I find that in the reign of Henry VII., and long antecedent to that period, many priests and nuns from Ireland joined the English abbeys and convents; and the nuns who made the bravest resistance to Lord Cromwell were Irish ladies, who courted martyrdom on several occasions." Far be it from the DUBLIN REVIEW to undervalue the heroism and many virtues of the Irish religious, but before we can place full reliance on Mr. Burke's statement we require more proof than he has yet given. He only mentions the case of the Chaunceys, one of whom became a Carthusian at London, and two sisters joined the Benedictine Abbey at Shaftesbury. The only other instance that occurs to us (and our reading in this department of literature has not been limited), is F. William Tynsby, an Irishman of distinguished holiness, who died in 1529, after thirty years' Priorship of the London Charterhouse. A few isolated facts like this make us unwilling to deprive the English religious of the honours asserted for them in the "Dublin" of 1877. Certainly some of the most prominent opposers of the innovations under Henry VIII., such as Katherine Bulkeley, the last Abbess of Godstone, and her fellow religious Rose Herbert, Isabel Sackville, the Prioress of Clerkenwell, Sybilla Newdigate, Prioress of Holiwell, and Isabel Whitehead, who afterwards died a prisoner for the faith in York Castle, Alice Fitzherbert, of Polesworth, and Agnes Lawson, of St. Bartholomew's, at Newcastle-on-Tyne, all Englishwomen born, and all of whom figure honourably in the annals of the time, vindicate the claims of the English nuns to at least equal honours with their Irish religious sisters.

There are other points which we should like to touch upon, but their consideration must be deferred. It must not be imagined that our remarks are unkindly meant; on the contrary, it is with the hope that, in successive volume and future editions, the wants we have pointed out may be supplied, that we have ventured to call attention to what we consider a drawback to the higher uses of an otherwise excellent work.

History of the Reformation in Germany and Switzerland chiefly. By Dr. K. R. HAGENBACH. Translated by EVELINA MOORE. Vol. II. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1879.

WE expressed our opinion of the merit, or rather the want of merit, of this work, when noticing the first volume in April of last year. The perusal of the second volume has not changed that opinion. There

* The passage occurs at p. 908 of the "Nouveau Theatre du Monde," par D. T. V. T. Paris, Boulanger, 1644.

is in this volume, *inter alia*, an attempt to review critically Luther's general character, in order to ascertain in what particularly lay the secret of his greatness. The author concludes that Luther was conspicuously neither a philosopher, nor a *savant*, nor a saint!—but that he was conspicuously “a genius presided over by Religion, and supported by a German spirit and nature.” We may agree to the last clause. The work of the translator is done well up to the end: it is a pity, indeed, that such very good work was not expended on a better book.

Oxford Sermons. Preached before the University, by the Rev. EDWIN A. ABBOTT, D.D., formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. London: Macmillan. 1879.

THIS book is chiefly notable as a “Sign of the Times” in the Established Church. For the last thirty years and more the Anglican Communion has been losing such semblance of dogmatic character as it once possessed. The defeat of the Tractarian party was the victory of religious Liberalism, and these Oxford Sermons of Dr. Abbotts show strikingly how far that victory has been carried. The Rationalism of the “Essays and Reviews” is as nothing to the Rationalism of this representative of the latest phase of Anglican development. The miracles of Our Blessed Lord, as recorded in the Gospels, together with the primary miracle of the Incarnation, he rejects altogether as additions to the original tradition, or as the “result of metaphor misunderstood,” (p. 142). The Resurrection he resolves into vision.

The same unique and unparalleled force which enabled Jesus, in the course of nature, to convert an enemy after death, may also, in the course of nature, have so thrilled the hearts of His disciples with the same creative desire and the same self-justifying trust, as to reproduce, first before one, and then before others who may have at first *doubted*—as the Gospel tells us they did—the same image of the risen and triumphant Saviour.

Thus, step by step, we are led, as the result of a dispassionate investigation, to see that we must accept as historical some kind of appearance, we will not say supernatural, but so marvellous that it well deserves some distinctive epithet, such as preternatural, whereby Jesus, after death, converted an enemy to a friend, and impelled the Christian Church on its career of conquest (p. 164).

So much may suffice as a specimen of Dr. Abbott's teaching; and surely we may say of it, with exact truth, in the words of the author of the New Republic, that “it is simply our modern Atheism trying to hide its own nakedness for the benefit of the more prudish part of the public, in the cast grave-clothes of Christ, who, whether he be risen or not, is very certainly, as the angel said, not *here*.”

Boston Monday Lectures, U.S., on Scepticism, Biology, Transcendentalism, &c. By the REV. JOSEPH COOK. First, Second, and Third Series. London: R. D. Dickenson, Farringdon street. 1878-9.

MR. COOK is a Protestant minister who has succeeded in gaining the ear of many of the better educated of the inhabitants of Boston. What is the precise variety of Protestantism which he professes we do not know, nor is it material to inquire. Evidently the backbone of his creed is New England Puritanism. His main positions are those of the Pilgrim Fathers, but he presents them in a new aspect, transformed, sublimated. Spiritually as physically, the Americans are not people of strong digestion; their mental palate is revolted by the coarse food which contented their simpler ancestors. Mr. Cook knows his countrymen, and caters for them accordingly. In his "Monday Lectures" he serves them quite "a dainty dish," which has been highly esteemed by a judicious public.

Mr. Cook ranges over a vast variety of subjects. Scepticism, Biology, Transcendentalism, the themes specified in his title-page, are wide terms enough, but they do not cover all his topics, he appends to them, and rightly, an *et cetera*. Glancing at random at the list of contents of his volumes, we come upon "The Microscope and Materialism," "Matthew Arnold's Views on Conscience," "Maudesley on Hereditary Descent," "Love Without Marriage," "Marriage Without Love," "True and False Optimism," "The Nerves and the Soul." That "to be various is to be superficial" is generally true; but we must do Mr. Cook the justice to say that manifold as are the subjects of his lectures, there is not one of them which is not worth reading. He is always earnest, eloquent, and thoughtful. A Catholic critic must find him sometimes wrong; but even his errors are suggestive. On the other hand, he is very frequently right. Thus, his arguments against Materialism are always forcible and often original, and his refutation of Theodore Parker's teaching is masterly. There is, in his compositions, more tall talk than is agreeable to English taste. But, of course, that might have been expected from an American popular lecturer. And sometimes his imagination takes very grotesque flights, as when he pictures Dean Stanley and Mr. Carlyle singing *Te Deum* as a duet (First Series, p. 130). But his volumes are full of pithy and pregnant sayings, sometimes not destitute of quiet humour. Take the following as specimens:—

It is now the highest office of philosophy to shew man not only that he has conscience; but that conscience has him. (First Series, p. 22.)

All disloyalty to the "still small voice" which declares what ought to be, is followed by pain. *What if it were not?* Is God God, if, with our scientific literature, we, in our philosophy, put the throne of the universe upon rockers, and make of it an easy chair from which lullabies are sung, both to the evil and the good? (*Ibid.* p. 40).

Matthew Arnold's out-look on religious science and philosophy is like a woman's out-look on politics. (*Ibid.* p. 44.)

Our present philosophies, metaphysical and physical, all stand on the basis of self-evident truths, or intuitions; and although your physicist,

who never has studied metaphysics, does not know who sharpened his tools, or, sometimes, what his tools are, he, every day, is using self-evident truth, and stands on the intuitions at which he scoffs. (*Ibid.* p. 56).

Americans have all sorts of sense, except historic sense." (*Ibid.* p. 32).

Mr. Cook reminds us more of the late Rev. F. W. Robertson than of any other English divine. He has not, indeed, the Brighton Apostle's polish, but he appears to have wider reading and a more powerful intellect. We have read his lectures on the whole with pleasure, but with a strong feeling of what is lacking to him. It is a deficiency which Catholic philosophy and theology alone can supply.

Mind in the Lower Animals in Health and Disease. By W. LAUDER LINDSAY, M.D. In Two Vols. London: C. Kegan Paul and Co. 1879.

DR. LAUDER LINDSAY, as we learn from the introduction to his work, is a Scotch physician, the special business of whose life it has been, as he expresses it, "to deal with the phenomena on abnormal mentalization in man." More than twenty years ago, he tells us, it fell to his lot to conduct a series of investigations in Comparative Pathology, and latterly his studies have been determined in the direction of Pscycopathology. He "was led, in the first instance, to inquire what relation madness in the lower animals bears to insanity in man, the result being the conviction that the lower animals are subject to the same kinds of mental disorders, producible by the same causes as in man. This inquiry formed but the precursor to a much more comprehensive investigation of the normal phenomena of mind throughout the animal kingdom" (Int. p. xii.). The result of that "comprehensive inquiry" is the work now given to the world.

It is not an easy task to say anything by way of criticism on these volumes because of the uncertainty in which we find ourselves as to the point of view from which they should be regarded. When we first took them up we were inclined to look upon them as a colossal skit, and although the grave profession and Caledonian nationality of the author militate against that hypothesis, we do not feel sure that it is not the true one. Dr. Lindsay's method is a very simple one. He takes, on the one hand, certain of the lower animals, and, on the other, adult savage man, and then draws a comparison not flattering to humanity.

If, (he says,) the student will take the trouble of comparing, one by one, the negative qualities—intellectual and moral—of savage man with the positive qualities of certain other animals—especially the well-bred dog—the conclusion arrived at will probably be what appears to me the inevitable one, that *psychical superiority* frequently pertains to the "lower" animal and not to man (vol. I. p. 50).

The author, it will be seen, is a disciple of Captain Lemuel Gulliver.

Dr. Lindsay's first volume is devoted to the mind of the lower animals in health. He considers this subject under the five heads of "Morality and Religion," "Education and its Results," "Language," "Adaptiveness," "Fallibility." For a specimen of his method let us turn to his chapter on "Religious Feeling in the Lower Animals." He quotes, approvingly, the saying attributed to Robert Burns, that "man is the god of the dog—the canine god, in a far more real sense than the God of the Bible is the subject of genuine adoration by many so-called Christians."

The dogs' *worship of man* (he continues) in many respects compares favourably with much at least of man's worship of superior beings, real or supposed, animate, inanimate, or spiritual. It does so, for instance, in the *quality* and *duration* of the *love* which it lavishes, not alone upon the person, but upon the memory and the belongings of the being it adores.

Its affection is not only pure, sincere, earnest, hearty, thorough; it is also disinterested, for it survives neglect and cruelty of all kinds. It is simple, for the animal seems to be possessed but of one dominant idea, and that is his master (p. 221).

All this, alas, is true enough. A little further on the author writes:—

Dogs not only worship man, but they attend worship with him—take part so far in his religious observances. In doing so the following points are to be specially noted:—1. The appropriateness of their behaviour to the place and time, varying in the case of the dogs of Protestant and Catholic masters attending Protestant or Catholic churches or chapels; and, 2. The correct perception of time and locality: a subject, however, that falls more appropriately to be treated of in another chapter. Church attendance by dogs is, and has long been, a common phenomenon in the pastoral districts of Scotland. Scotch shepherds, both in Highlands and Lowlands, are a devout, church-attending race; and, so far at least as concerns regularity of attendance upon the ordinances of worship, and demure, decorous behaviour thereat, their dogs or "collies," are equally devout. These Scotch collies frequently have particular seats or pews—or at least their equivalents—lairs or crouching-places—in church; and there, when no attempt is made by them—as it sometimes is—at psalm-singing, the animals rest quietly and sedately until the completion of the service. It may be, and probably is, the case that they frequently coil themselves comfortably and compose themselves to sleep as soon as the service has begun; but that a similar process is quite as common and much more conspicuous and inexcusable in man, I have no room for doubting, inasmuch as I have over and over again myself seen in country—ay, and in city—churches in Scotland, people, mostly males, be it in fairness explained, deliberately composing themselves for a good, sound sleep before the service begins; a sleep so natural in one sense, as to be not unfrequently accompanied by snoring, and to require vigorous nudging or shaking to rouse from it. . . . Scotch shepherds' collies are not, however, the only dogs that have been popularly, and with a certain degree of propriety, denominated "religious." In France, a Catholic country, dogs attend prayers or Mass with their masters, exhibiting in the grand cathedrals of that beautiful land a becoming behaviour, including a gravity of look and

demeanour, silence and motionlessness, an attitude of apparent attention or intentness, and a probable feeling of awe, produced it may be, by the "dim religious light" of such edifices, or by the varied, impressive sights and sounds that environ them—a kind of conduct, in short, only too instructive or suggestive to irreverent man. It would appear farther that, in Catholic countries, imitation of man leads church-going dogs to the stage of fasting, so that Catholic and Protestant dogs may be spoken of with somewhat of propriety, the one group fasting and attending Mass and all Church festivals, like Catholics; the other going to the kirk and sometimes at least attempting psalm-singing, like Protestants or Presbyterians (vol. i. pp. 221-232).

It is passages such as these—and they are very frequent—which favour the supposition that the work is, in truth, a somewhat ponderous satire. But if it is in sober earnest intended as a contribution to science, we can only say that the writer's notions of the nature and force of evidence are as singular as is his mode of citing his authorities. Instead of giving us "chapter and verse" for the references which teem in almost every page, he mentions merely the author or the newspaper on which he relies. "Hozeau," "Animal World," "Figuier," "Daily Telegraph," such is his invariable mode of indicating the sources to which he has recourse for his facts, or what do duty as such.

As somebody has somewhere said,
Or in some book I've somewhere read,

Is in truth what it amounts to. And what shall we say of a writer (always supposing him to be serious) who, in canine "Church attendance, observance of rites or ceremonies, seriousness of demeanour," finds "evidence of religion in the dog?" (vol. i. p. 232), or who apparently supposes that the following words contain an argument: "Those who have studied *bird-song* have pointed out the interesting fact that the song of the nightingale and other singing birds is capable of reduction to and interpretation by words. It may be translated into man's written words, and it is therefore, in a sense, quite proper to speak of the articulation of bird songs" (*Ibid.* 306). We read, in Swift, of certain ingenious mechanicians of the city of Nuremburg who had invented a man of wood and leather that would reason as well as most country parsons, a "fact" which, by the way, Dr. Lauder Lindsay has strangely overlooked. Certainly—to borrow, with a slight change, our author's words—if the student will take the trouble of comparing, one by one, the negative qualities of the wood and leather personage with the positive qualities of Dr. Lauder Lindsay, the conclusion arrived at will probably be, what appears to us the inevitable one, that *logical superiority* pertains to the Nuremburg creation, and not to Dr. Lauder Lindsay.

Theism : being the Baird Lecture for 1876. By ROBERT FLINT, D.D., LL.D. Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh, Second Edition. Blackwood : Edinburgh and London. 1878.

Anti-Theistic Theories : being the Baird Lecture for 1877. By ROBERT FLINT, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh. Blackwood : Edinburgh and London.

THESE two works, as Professor Flint tells in the prefatory note, may be regarded as two parts of a system of natural theology, which is still very far from complete. In the Lectures on Theism, the author, after passing in review the issues involved in the questions, Whence and How we get the ideas of God ? and, considering the nature and conditions of theistic proof, discusses, in detail, the argument from causality, the argument from order and the moral argument, that is to say, the argument from conscience and history. Then, after considering the ordinary objections to the Divine wisdom, benevolence and justice, he passes on to the *à priori* theistic proof, and concludes by a demonstration of the insufficiency of mere theism. In the Lectures on Anti-Theistic Theories, Atheism, Materialism, both in its ancient and modern forms, Positivism, Secularism, Pessimism and Pantheism, are dealt with. Agnosticism is passed over, because, as the author explains, he is anxious to avoid, in a semi-popular work, abstruse metaphysical discussion, and because he hopes to be able to publish, at some future time, an historical and critical examination of this form of negation, in its various phases.

Such is, in brief, the contribution made by Professor Flint to the discussion of these grave matters, and it is a sincere pleasure to us to be able to bear emphatic testimony to the sterling value of his work. Throughout his volumes there is evidence of wide reading, strong common sense, and religious earnestness. And nothing can be more admirable than the spirit in which he approaches his task, as manifested in the following passage :—

The greatest issues, then, are involved in the investigation on which we enter. Can we think what these are, or reflect on their greatness, without drawing this inference, that we ought, in conducting it, to have no other end before us than that of seeking, accepting, and communicating the truth ? This is here so important that everything beside it must be insignificant and unworthy. Any polemical triumphs which could be gained either by logical or rhetorical artifices would be unspeakably paltry. Nothing can be appropriate in so serious a discussion but to state as accurately as we can the reasons for our own belief in theism, and to examine as carefully and impartially as we can the objections of those who reject that belief. It can only do us harm to overrate the worth of our own convictions and arguments, or to underrate the worth of those of others. We must not dare to carry into the discussion the spirit of men who feel that they have a case to advocate at all hazards. We must not try to conceal a weakness in our argumentation by saying hard things of those who endeavour to point it out. There is no doubt that character has an influence on creed, that the state of a man's feelings determines to a considerable extent, the nature of his beliefs, that badness of heart is often the cause of perversity of judgment ; but we

have no right to begin any argument by assuming that this truth has its bright side—its side of promise—turned towards us, and its dark and threatening side turned toward those who differ from us. If we can begin by assuming our opponents to be wicked, why should we not assume them at once to be wrong, and so spare ourselves the trouble of arguing with them? It would be better to begin by assuming only what no one will question, namely, that it is a duty to do to others as we would have others do to us. When a man errs, it is a kindness to show him his error—and the greater the error, the greater the kindness; but error is so much its own punishment to every ingenuous nature, that to convince a man of it is all that one fallible person ought to do to another. The scoff and the sneer are out of place in all serious discussion; especially are they out of place when our minds are occupied with thoughts of Him who, if He exist, is the Father and Judge of us all, who alone possesses the full truth, and who has made us that we might love one another.—*Lectures on Theism*, p. 19.

From the tone of mind here indicated, Professor Flint never varies, we think, throughout the two volumes before us. He calls things, indeed, by their right names. He does not disguise the surprise, the pain, the repulsion caused him by certain theories with which he has to deal. He exposes, unsparingly, the fallacies which he has to encounter in the course of his task: exhibits assumptions in their true character, and points out absurdities with a touch of dry humour. But he never mistakes invective for argument, nor attempts to strengthen his own case by understating his opponent's. He knows well that temper and candour are the prime requisites of a controversialist, and has laid to heart the truth so admirably expressed by Wordsworth:—

He only judges right who weighs, compares,
And in the sternest sentence that his voice
Pronounces, e'er remembers charity.

So much we must say in praise of the volume before us. There are in it, indeed, as might have been expected, arguments which we cannot unreservedly follow, and statements as to matters of fact to which exception must be taken. Let us cite a paragraph—with which, in the main, we fully agree—where Professor Flint has misrepresented, quite unintentionally, we are sure, a very eminent Catholic writer.

We have seen how the power manifest in the universe leads up to God as the First Cause, the all-originating Will. We have seen also how the order manifest in the universe leads up to Him as the Supreme Intelligence. But there is more in the universe than force and order; there is force which works for good, and a just and benevolent order; there are moral laws and moral actions, moral perceptions and moral feelings. Can anything be thence inferred as to whether God is, and what He is? I think we shall find that they clearly testify both as to His existence and character.

The moral law, which reveals itself to conscience, has seemed to certain authors so decisive a witness of God, that all other witnesses may be dispensed with. Kant, who exerted his great logical ability to prove that the speculative reason, in searching after God, inevitably loses itself in

sophisms and self-contradictions, believed himself to have found, in the practical reason or moral faculty, an assurance for the Divine existence and government capable of defying the utmost efforts of scepticism. Sir William Hamilton has also affirmed that "the only valid arguments for the existence of God, and for the immortality of the human soul, rest on the ground of man's moral nature." Dr. John Newman has insisted that conscience is the creative principle of religion, and has endeavoured to show how the whole doctrine of natural religion should be worked out from this central principle. A well-known living theologian of Germany, Dr. Schenkel, has attempted to build up a complete theology on conscience as a basis, starting from the position that conscience is "The religious organ of the soul"—the faculty through which alone we have an intimate knowledge of God. These thinkers may have erred in relying thus exclusively on the moral argument—I believe that they have—but the error, if error there be, shows only the more clearly how convincing that argument has seemed to certain minds, and these assuredly not feeble minds. The moral argument is not to be exclusively relied on. It is but a part of a whole from which it ought not to be severed. The office of bearing witness to the existence and character of God can be safely devolved on no one principle alone, even although that principle be conscience. It is a work in which all the principles of human nature are privileged to concur. Either all bear true testimony, or all have conspired to deceive us. The self-manifestation of God is addressed to the entire man, and can only be rightly apprehended by the concurrent action of all the energies and capacities of the soul.—*Lectures on Theism*, pp. 210–214.

Now, of course, we are well aware of the great stress which Cardinal Newman lays upon the argument from conscience, of the unspeakable force with which he has found it come home to him, in his own case. But Professor Flint is very much in error in ranking His Eminence among those who rely exclusively upon it, who regard conscience as "so decisive a witness for God, that all other evidence may be dispensed with." On the contrary, Cardinal Newman has himself very powerfully drawn out the argument from order in a passage in his "*Grammar of Assent*."

As a cause implies a will, so does order imply a purpose. Did we see flint cells in their various receptacles all over Europe, scored with certain special and characteristic marks, even though those marks had no assignable meaning or final cause whatever, we should take that very repetition, which indeed is the principle of order, to be a proof of intelligence. The agency, then, which has kept up, and *still* keeps up, the general laws of nature, energizing at once in Sirius and the earth, and on the earth in its primitive period as well as in the nineteenth century, must be Mind, and nothing else; and Mind at least as wide and enduring in its living action as the immeasurable ages and spaces of the universe on which that agency has left its traces (iv. i. 4).

It is perfectly true that in a passage of the "*Oxford University Sermons*" we read:—

It is a great question whether atheism is not as philosophically consistent with the phenomena of the physical world, taken by themselves, as the doctrine of a creative and governing power (p. 194, 3rd edition).

But in the last edition, from which we quote, the Cardinal has guarded himself against misconception, by the following note :—

“Physical phenomena, taken by themselves ;” that is, apart from psychological phenomena, apart from moral considerations, apart from the moral principles by which they must be interpreted, and apart from that idea of God which wakes up in the mind under the stimulus of intellectual training. The question is, whether physical phenomena logically *teach* us, or on the other hand logically *remind* us of the Being of a God. In either case, if they do not bring to us this cardinal truth, we are, in St. Paul’s words, “without excuse.”

Once more, in his Discourses to Mixed Congregations, in the sermon on “Mysteries of Nature and Grace,” His Eminence observes :—

The state of the case is this :—Every one spontaneously embraces the doctrine of the existence of God as a first principle and a necessary assumption. It is not so much proved to him, as borne in upon his mind irresistibly, as a truth which it does not occur to him, nor is possible for him to doubt, so various and so abundant is the witness for it contained in the experience and conscience of every one. He cannot unravel the process or put his finger on the independent arguments, which conspire together to create in him the certainty which he feels ; but certain of it he is, and he has neither the temptation nor the wish to doubt it, and he could, should need arise, at least point to the books or the persons whence he could obtain the various formal proofs on which the Being of a God rests and the irrefragable demonstration thence resulting against the free-thinker and the sceptic.

It would be easy to multiply quotations to the same effect, but the three passages which we have cited will doubtless be sufficient to satisfy Professor Flint that our exception is well found.

Sermons on some Questions of the Day. Preached before the University of Cambridge, and in the Chapel Royal, Whitehall, by T. G. BONNEY, F.R.S. Cambridge. 1878.

IN these sermons Mr. Bonney has treated of certain matters with which the teachings of the Christian religion and the discoveries of physical science are popularly supposed to conflict. A Member of the University of Cambridge, of considerable academical distinction, and a Fellow of the Royal Society, he claims, not without reason, to be in an exceptionally favourable position for undertaking this task. “For some years” he writes :—

I have had better opportunities of regarding questions of theology and science from both standpoints than the majority of the clergy. Further, the greater part of my adult life has been spent in University work, so that from personal experience I know well of what importance these questions are to many thoughtful men, and what great mischief is being done by the supposed incompatibility of perfect freedom in scientific inquiry and of a sincere belief in Christianity. As I personally have not found very advanced scientific views (to use a common phrase) irreconcilable with a firm belief in Jesus Christ and His teaching as recorded in the New Testament, I venture to hope that, if this book

attract any attention, some good may result from showing the way in which certain of the questions and difficulties of the present day have presented themselves to my own mind (Pref. p. iv.).

This is the scope of Mr. Bonney's undertaking, an undertaking surely in every way praiseworthy. As to the measure of success which he has attained, we must speak with more reserve. It is doubtless matter for sincere satisfaction that Mr. Bonney has not found "advanced scientific views" incompatible with the teaching of Jesus Christ. But the question arises, how far Mr. Bonney truly apprehends the teaching of Jesus Christ. It is always matter for speculation what anyone external to the Catholic Church means, when he talks of the teaching of Jesus Christ. It is the absence of an authoritative interpretation of that teaching, it may be truly said, as to the meaning which it is made to bear, *quot homines tot sententie*. We gather, however, from Mr. Bonney's book, that he believes in the existence of a personal God, in the reality of sin, in the resurrection of Jesus Christ, and in the efficacy of prayer. In the present day this is much. And no doubt good may have been done and may yet be done, by the arguments, some of them exceedingly well and ably put, which Mr. Bonney offered to his congregations at Cambridge and Whitehall, and now offers to the world at large to prove that these beliefs are quite reconcilable with "advanced" views of physical science. As a specimen of these arguments take the following extract from a sermon on "The Rationality of Prayer:"—

When we use the phrase "Divine government of the world," we commonly import our anthropomorphic ideas into a sphere for which they are wholly unfitted. The notion of personal government in our mind is quite opposed to that of law, because man is weak and fallible, is unfit to exercise anything like unlimited authority, and, as a rule, is capricious and wayward in its exercise, in proportion as all restraining influences are removed. The history of despots shows them to be those of our race whose actions it was the most difficult to predict, whose procedure was generally more anomalous. But, in proportion to the goodness of a man's character, so will his conduct be more and more distinctly a manifestation of law. Hence, to speak of "law of nature" and "providence of God" as if they were something opposed one to the other, appears to me an entire misapprehension. The most ordinary law of nature, the phenomena which surround us, the mode and conditions of our lives, are really the result of the laws of God and the will of God as much as any incident which would be considered a miracle. In short, such a term, except as a synonym for the unexpected or comparatively unprecedented, seems to me unintelligible, and any essential opposition between law and miracle a mistake. It is quite true that in one sense of the words, the sphere of the miraculous decreases as knowledge increases, but it is not so in another. The apparent violation or supercession of the law of nature in cases, which we call answers to prayers or special providences, is not necessarily one whit the less a result of law than the most ordinary incident of life. Great and small, complicated and simple, are words which are applicable only to man's point of view. Startling as it may seem, we need not fear to accept the Saviour's assertion about the grass of the field and the birds of the air as really more consistent with the true ideal of God, than many a statement of recent philosophy. The Almighty, in answering a prayer,

even with reference to the operation of natural laws, need not in any way be acting arbitrarily or with uncertainty. He may be, in the one case, as in the other, self-consistent, and His actions be the manifestations of those laws of which He is the source. Asking, as a condition of having, is familiar enough in daily life, and is not generally thought to involve an idea of arbitrariness or anomaly.

But, it may be said, how can you talk of law when at one time a certain consequence follows as the result of a series of causes, and at another something quite different, and, it may be, wholly unprecedented? I reply that it is quite as much an assumption to assert that the series of causes is the same in these cases, as that God can hear and answer prayer. I have already mentioned a rough illustration of the case where the causes seemed unchanged when really there was a most important difference, namely, whether a substance was magnetized or not. To this argument it is objected:—such a result comes from a perfectly known cause, the experiment can be repeated at pleasure, and here is the essential difference. I answer that I fail to see this difference. In the one case I know all the causes necessary to produce a result. It follows. But in the other case I do not. I may think that I know them, but I have no proof that I do (p. 81).

In conclusion, we must observe that one thing is certainly lacking to Mr. Bonney. From time to time, in his volume, he reflects with more or less severity, upon "the Church of Rome," her teaching and her practices, in a manner which convinces us that he has no true conception either of Catholic teaching, or of the religious life of Catholics. This is the more to be lamented as his book abounds with evidence that his mind is not naturally narrow or uncandid, and as in several points (we may instance, as an example, what he says as to the merely negative character of evil, p. 50) he appears to have arrived, by his own study and reflection, at conclusions identical, to a great extent, with doctrines taught by the Catholic Church. We are convinced that if Mr. Bonney would give himself up to the study of, say, St. Thomas and Suarez, Catholic theology would present itself to his mind in a very different light, and would prove of inestimable help to him in the arduous discussions to which he has devoted himself. Or, if this is too much to expect—and much as it is, it ought not to be too much—we would, at all events, beg of him to peruse carefully two volumes of Cardinal Newman's, his "*Anglican Difficulties*," and his "*Present Position of Catholics*." If Mr. Bonney would read these two not very formidable books in that fair and dispassionate spirit which we think we may look for from him, we feel convinced that his views of "the Church of Rome" would undergo great modifications.

Dante, an Essay. By R. W. CHURCH, M.A., D.C.L., Dean of St. Paul's and Honorary Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. To which is added a translation of the *De Monarchia*, by F. J. CHURCH. London. 1879.

WE are very glad the Dean of St. Paul's has republished, in a separate form, this *Essay*, to which, perhaps, we can give no higher praise than to say of it, that it is not unworthy of its subject.

It was, indeed, in a right spirit that Mr. Church addressed himself to his task. After observing that the Divine Comedy stands with the Iliad and Shakspeare's Plays, with the writings of Aristotle and Plato, with the Novum Organum and the Principia, with the Justinian Code and with the Parthenon and St. Peter's, as a landmark of human history, that it opens European literature as the Iliad did that of Greece and Rome, he continues:—

We approach the history of such works, in which genius seems to have pushed its achievements to a new limit, with a kind of awe. The beginnings of all things, their bursting out from nothing, and gradual evolution into substance and shape, cast on the mind a solemn influence. They come too near the fount of Being to be followed up without our feeling the shadows which surround it. We cannot but fear, cannot but feel ourselves cut off from this visible and familiar world as we enter into the cloud. And as it is with the process of nature, so it is with those offsprings of man's mind, by which he has added, permanently, one more great feature to the world, and created a new power which is to act on mankind to the end. The mystery of the inventive and creative faculty, the subtle and incalculable combinations by which it was led to its work, and carried through it, are out of the reach of investigating thoughts. Often the idea recurs of the precariousness of the result; by how little the world might have lost one of its ornaments—by one sharp pang, or one chance meeting, or any other among the countless accidents among which man runs his course. And then the solemn recollection supervenes that powers were formed, and life preserved, and circumstances arranged, and actions controlled, that thus it should be; and the work which man has brooded over, and at last created, is the foster-child, too, of that "Wisdom which reaches from end to end, strangely and sweetly disposing all things" (p. 2).

The refined taste, correctness of judgment, accuracy of scholarship, and loftiness of thought, which characterize Mr. Church, offer sufficient guarantees that the work undertaken in so admirable a spirit would be as admirably carried out. And so it has been. Of course we by no means pledge ourselves to the entire endorsement of all that he advances. Here we have to enter a *caveat*. There a protest. But it is pleasanter, in the case of such a writer, to dwell upon our very numerous points of agreement, than upon our comparatively few points of difference, in judging of Dante. Let us then, quote, as a specimen of his work, the following passage, with which we entirely agree:—

Dante has had hard measure, and from some who are most beholden to him. No one in his day served the Church more highly than he whose faith and genius secured on her side the first great burst of imagination and feeling, the first perfect accents of modern speech. The first fruits of the new literature were consecrated, and offered up. There was no necessity, or even probability in Italy, in the fourteenth century, that it should be so, as there might perhaps have been earlier. It was the poet's free act—free in one, for whom nature and heathen learning had strong temptations—that religion was the lesson and influence of the great popular work of the time. That which he held up before men's awakened and captivated minds, was the verity of God's moral government. To rouse them to a sense of the mystery of their state; to startle their commonplace notions of sin into an imagination of its variety, its

magnitude, and its infinite shapes and degrees; to open their eyes to the beauty of the Christian temper, both as suffering and as consummated; to teach them at once the faithfulness and awful freeness of God's grace; to help the dull and lagging soul to conceive the possibility, in its own case, of rising step by step in joy without an end—of a felicity not unimaginable by man, though of another order from the highest perfection of earth—this is the poet's end. Nor was it only vague religious feelings which he wished to excite. He brought within the circle of common thought, and translated into the language of the multitude, what the schools had done to throw light on the deep questions of human existence which all are fain to muse upon, though none can solve. He who had opened so much of men's hearts to themselves, opened to them also that secret sympathy which exists between them and the great mysteries of the Christian doctrine. He did the work, in his day, of a great preacher (p. 121).

Zechariah and his Prophecies, considered in relation to Modern Criticism; with a Critical and Grammatical Commentary, and new translation. (Bampton Lectures, 1878.) By CHARLES HENRY HAMILTON WRIGHT, B.D., of Trinity College, Dublin, &c., &c. Second Edition. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1879.

WE regard this book as one of the most important contributions to the study of Scripture which has appeared in England for many years. It is a book in every way creditable to English (or perhaps we should say Irish) scholarship. Mr. Wright is well able to hold his own against any of the German critics. His book shows wide and accurate reading in biblical criticism. He is evidently a man of sound and independent judgment. He writes in a clear and interesting way. He never substitutes vituperation for argument, or evades for one moment the difficulties he undertakes to meet. He is clearly a Protestant of the Low Church school, but, after reading his book through with great care, we have scarcely found a word to which a Catholic need object. "Modern Roman Catholic divines," he says, "who have written on Zechariah, have afforded me much assistance, and I rejoice to be able to acknowledge the unsectarian spirit and scholar-like manner in which they have treated the subject." Mr. Wright, himself, in defending the authenticity and unity of the Prophecies of Zacharias, has been defending Catholic tradition against the attacks of modern Protestant criticism. It is gratifying to observe that a work of such bulk and of such solid learning has already reached a second edition.

Perhaps the most interesting and important part of Mr. Wright's book is that which deals with the unity of authorship. It is acknowledged on all hands that the first nine chapters of Zacharias are the genuine work of Zacharias, the son of Barachias, who, along with Aggeus, prophesied at Jerusalem in the reign of Darius Hystaspis. But a large class of critics consider it absolutely certain that the last chapters of the prophecy, as we have it in our Bible (*i.e.* caps. ix.—xiv.), do not come from the same author. Hitzig, in his *Commentary on the Minor Prophets*, treats the matter in the dictatorial style so familiar in writers

of his school. "The question," he says, "whether the author of Zechariah ix.—xiv. is identical or not with the author of the first chapter is essentially connected with the fundamental question whether there is or can be such a thing as historical criticism." Ewald, in his famous book on "The Prophets of the Old Testament," does not seem to consider the matter worth serious discussion. On matters of detail (whether, for instance, the last chapters are due to one author or more than one), those who deny the original unity of the book as we have it, are not agreed; but they profess themselves certain that the prophet who wrote the first nine did not write the last five chapters, and usually they make the author of the latter part live at a period previous to the exile.

It cannot fairly be said that these critics are without plausible argument for this theory. Even the reader of Zacharias in English or Latin can scarcely fail to be struck with the poetical style of the former, the prosaic style of the latter chapters. Again, in the latter chapters, the humbling of Assyria (x. 11) is spoken of as future, or at least as just taking place; the people are to be restored to Gilead and Lebanon, which had been wasted by Tiglath Pileser (x. 10): the whole language at the beginning of the eleventh chapter appears to point to an Assyrian invasion of the kingdom of Israel: the kingdom of Israel and Judah are spoken of (xi. 14) as if both still existed. Again, the twelfth chapter, at first sight at least, can be naturally referred to the impending siege of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans. Lastly, the mention of idolatry which has still to be "cut off," from the chosen people is more consistent with the state of the Jews before than after the return from Babylon.

We have not space enough to give at length Mr. Wright's answer to these and similar difficulties. Of some of them, in our opinion, he has completely disposed. And he has given the best proof that the last chapter need not have been written before the exile, by his own commentary, which contains a rational exposition of each verse in the disputed chapter, based throughout on the assumption of the traditional date. He draws out with a masterly hand the argument from the resemblance in the last chapter to passages in writings of the other prophets.

Mr. Wright, moreover, supplies an excellent commentary on the whole prophecy from beginning to end. He has not, of course, the genius of Ewald; he cannot rival—(who can?)—the marvellous felicity with which that great scholar seizes the characteristics of a writer or of an age. But what sound judgment and sound scholarship can do, Mr. Wright does. He has searched everywhere for anything that can throw light on Zacharias. He points out, for instance, how the Assyrian inscriptions have at last settled the meaning of the difficult words at the beginning of chapter ix. "The oracle of the word of the Lord on the land of Hadrach and Damascus is its resting-place." He also gives admirable critical notes on the Hebrew text, and directs special attention to that difficult branch of Hebrew learning, the laws of the accents. Delitzsch has set a good example in this respect. And he gives information of wonderful interest with regard to the theology of the Targums and the Rabbins. We could have wished that the Introduc-

tion had given a fuller account of the exact divergencies of opinion among critics hostile to the unity of the book. And we are inclined to think that too much help is given on points of grammar, where even a young student might be left to find the solution for himself in Gesenius, or, still better, in Kalisch. But this last is a matter of practical experience, and it is hard to draw the line between excess and defect.

W. E. ADDIS.

Compendium totius Theologicæ Veritatis VII. Libris Digestum. Per Fratrem JOANNEM DE COMBIS, ordinis Minorum. Accedunt utiles Annotationes, cum Divi Bonaventuræ Terminorum Theologalium declaratione. Denuo edidit Fr. EPHREM, Abbas B.M. de Trappa de Monte Olivarum, pp. 463. Friburgi: Herder. 1880. (*Compendium of the whole of Theological Truth.* By F. JOHN DE COMBIS. Freiburg: Herder. 1880.)

THE author of this small Compendium of Theology, was Lector in the house of his Order, at Lyons, where he published this work in 1569. The work is divided into seven books, and not only contains theology, in the strict meaning of the word, but expatiates also on philosophical science, inasmuch as it declares or defends supernatural truth. The doctrine of the human soul and its faculties, is very exhaustively explained, pp. 99-127. The same praise must be given to the author for his solid explanation of eschatology, all the more as it is a matter which, in our days, meets with many adversaries. Father Combis, belonging, as he does, to the Franciscan school, is no extreme Scotist, but generally follows St. Thomas as his master. A most appropriate and useful addition to the work is S. Bonaventura's "explanation of theological terms," which truly deserves the name of another manual of theology in miniature. To those who intend studying the works of the seraphic doctor it will prove very serviceable. Special thanks are due to the editor for having brought before the public this little jewel in a modern setting.

B.

Theatrum Virtutum Stanislai Cardinalis Hosii, Episcopi Warmiensis. Per THOMAM Treterum (anno 1685 editum). Nunc denuo editum. Brunsberg, ex officina Warmiensi, 1879. (*The Works of Cardinal Stanislaus Hosius.* New edition. Brunsberg, 1879).

Acta Historica res gestas Poloniæ illustrantia. No. 15. *Stanislai Hosii, S.R.E. Cardinalis Majoris Pænitentiarii, Episcopi Warmiensis, et quæ ad eum scriptæ sunt Epistolæ tum etiam ejus Orationes et Legationes.* Tom. I. 1525-1550. Editionem curaverunt Dr. HIPLER, Sycei Hosiani Brunsberg, Professor et Dr. ZAHREZWSKI Caes, Univ. Cracovien, Professor Aracoriæ, 1879. (*Historical Documents illustrating the History of Poland.* No. 15. *Letters, &c., of Cardinal Hosius.* Edited by Dr. HIPLER and Dr. ZAHREZWSKI. Krakow, 1879).

AMONGST the great ecclesiastical men to whom Poland, and many dioceses belonging in our days to the Eastern Provinces of Prussia, are indebted for the preservation of the Catholic religion,

foremost stands Stanislaus Cardinal Hosius, Bishop of Ermland, 1550-1579. Having completed his studies in Padua and Bologna, where he entered into close friendship with Reginald Pole, he was appointed secretary to the Chancellor of the Kingdom of Poland, and afterwards obtained the see of Ermland. There are not to be found many divines in that period who can be compared to him in solidity of doctrine and accuracy of reasoning. We might fitly call him the German Stapleton, because, like Stapleton, in demonstrating the Supremacy of the Holy See, he never employs the Pseudo-Isidore. On the three hundredth anniversary of the Cardinal's death, August 5, 1879, Dr. Hipler, President of the Episcopal Seminary of Braunsberg, re-edited the "*Theatrum Virtutum*," in which Treterus, the Cardinal's secretary, praises his holy life. Let me quote one passage referring to Hosius's close friendship with Bishop Goldwell, the last survivor of the ancient English hierarchy (p. 98).

Sanderos et Alanos Goldwelsesque Schælesque
Ad se vocatos saepe consulebat.

Together with Dr. Zahrzewsky, Professor Hipler is now beginning a splendid critical edition, in four bulky volumes, of all the documents relating to this great Prince of the Church. They reach the immense number of almost ten thousand, and are buried in great part in the Archives of Upsal and Linköping, Sweden. The first volume, furnished with excellent indices, and a summary of the life of Hosius from 1525-1550, contains more than four hundred documents, partly letters to princes and dignitaries, partly speeches delivered in Italy and in Brussels before the Emperor Charles V. They afford striking proofs of Hosius's immense learning, statesmanlike wisdom and deep Christian piety. At page 129 we meet with a letter to Cardinal Pole, and at page 208 a letter of Pole to Hosius about the exiled Archbishop of Upsal. Complying with the desire of the editors, we earnestly ask all English librarians, Catholics as well as Protestants, in case they should know of any letter written by or to Hosius, to be kind enough to communicate the fact to the Imperial Academy, Krakow, or to any of the above-named editors.

B.

Geschichte des Deutschen Volkes seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters.
VON JOHANNES JANSSEN. Erster Band. 1876. Zweiter Band.
1879. Freiburg: Herder. (*History of the German People from the
end of the Middle Ages.* By JOHN JANSSEN. Friburg: Herder.)

THE Rev. Professor Janssen, of Frankfort-on-the-Main, is publishing a work on the History of the German People from the end of the Middle Ages, which has won for him the highest praise from Catholic Germany, and which, from its peculiar merits, claims for a special notice in this Review. The success of Janssen's work, as far as Germany is concerned, is really unprecedented, the first volume having already gone through five editions, whilst eight thousand copies of the second have been sold in less than a year, and a new

edition is about to be published ere long. Many years ago Professor Janssen was most favourably known to Catholic Germany by his standard work, "Frankfurt's Reichs Correspondenz," containing the letters of the magistrates of the city, and of her ambassadors to the German Diet; by his learned books on the division of Poland, on Schiller as a historian, and principally by the extensive biography of Frederick Böhmer. The spirit which animated this eminent man, who, although a Protestant, has done more, by the publication of the "Kaiserregesten," than any Catholic scholar in Germany to direct the drift of historical investigation to the glorious periods marked by unity of faith and solidarity of the European nations, has been plentifully imbibed by Janssen. By his recent work Professor Janssen has entitled himself to rank with such Catholic historians as Cardinal Hergenröther, Bishop Hefele, Baron von Reumont, and Onno Klopp.

The unrivalled success of Professor Janssen's book is accounted for by two special characteristics—the manner in which he writes history, and the means he adopts. Considering his book from the first point, it is a standard work, worthy to be consulted by any Catholic in any country who writes history. The reader becomes acquainted with the history of the German *people*; it is not the external history of the country, its politics, its wars, that we are called to look on, but rather the interior history, as it manifests itself in culture, religious influences, spiritual attainments, and immortal monuments in every department of art. It may be fairly said that none but a Catholic can thoroughly understand the Middle Ages, when the Catholic Church was intimately connected with, and put its impress on, every institution of public and private life; and this principle ought to be held still more firmly when we enter the second part of the fifteenth century, when the Catholic spirit brings out its finest blossoms and fruits. It was a masterwork to lay before the public a multitude of unanswerable proofs showing that the very period immediately preceding the so-called Reformation was, as to art, science, religious monuments, social improvement, superior to any other of the Middle Ages; and far from being a time of darkness, spiritual and social dissolution, on the contrary, fully claims the admiration of every man who does not wilfully close his eyes. The astonishing and sad contrast between the second part of the fifteenth century, and the subsequent period of what has hitherto been styled the Reformation, but must henceforward be called an ecclesiastical and social revolution, will be seen in the second volume. As regards the manner in which Professor Janssen is performing his task, we are forced to admit that it is not so much the author himself, but the very men of the times gone by who are speaking to us. To Divine Providence we are largely indebted for the immense exertions which both Catholics and Protestants, since 1848, have devoted to the investigation of the Reformation period. Thirty years ago a work similar to Janssen's publication would have been a sheer impossibility. But since that time of political revolution, not dissimilar from the ecclesiastical revolution which happened three hundred years ago, Catholics

and Protestants in Germany have done their utmost to rescue from the dust of libraries and archives the all but innumerable manuscripts, *incunabula*, small pamphlets and every kind of popular and devotional literature bearing on the Reformation and the period immediately preceding it. Great stress has been laid by Professor Janssen on these small books or pamphlets, showing, as they do, the very effects produced by the ecclesiastical revolution on social and political departments. In masterly handling of the whole German literature bearing on the Reformation period, Professor Janssen is equalled by no living German historian. A good translation of this work would be very useful in England.

The first volume, entitled "The Intellectual Condition of Germany at the end of the Middle Ages," gives an interesting picture of the German people at that period. The first great figure which comes before us is a giant in the intellectual order, Nicholas, Cardinal of Cues, Bishop of Brixen, a bold philosopher and a pious Prince of the Church, and also a true reformer, who, as Papal Legate in Germany, brought about a real reformation in hundreds of religious communities. Next, we become acquainted with the beginnings of the Art of Printing. There is, perhaps, no invention calculated to produce deeper changes in every direction than the art of printing, which Germany can claim as her special prerogative. But long before the Reformation this art was largely employed in promoting every kind of culture. Brought face to face with Janssen's inquiries, Luther's assertion that he had "dragged the Bible from the shelf," is shown up in its utter falsehood. Long before the Reformers appeared on the stage, the Bible had been printed not only in Latin, but also in the German language, and besides the Holy Scriptures there existed in Germany a well-organized Catholic popular and devotional literature, as "*Reichspiegel*," "*Handpostille*," and the like. Twenty translations of the Bible were published in Germany before 1500.

The fifteenth century, moreover, witnessed the rise of many flourishing Universities. Professor Janssen gives the most interesting details on the culture and scientific attainments of the Universities of Cologne, Heidelberg, Freiburg, Basle, Tübingen, Ingolstadt, and Vienna. Besides the Universities there were spread all over Germany higher schools, like Eton and Rugby, conducted by the elder Humanists. A peculiar stress is justly laid by our author on the considerable difference between these men, and the school of younger Humanists, who, under the guidance of Erasmus, promoted by their liberalism the destructive tendencies of the Reformation. The former cultivated classical studies according to the great principles of the Fathers and the doctors of the Middle Ages; what they looked for in the immortal literary works of Athens and Rome was the *λογος σπερμετικός*, and the accomplished excellence of "form," which might be useful for the defence of Christian truth. The younger Humanists fell victims to the heathen doctrines embodied in the classics. Hence their strong opposition against the scholastics who were the great supporters of Catholic dogma. The arts of painting, sculpture, wood engraving,

and music attained a very high degree of perfection in the fifteenth century.

The second volume by degrees exhibits the forewarnings of a terrible storm, coming so suddenly, and making itself felt with such power, that Church, Empire, and Society were brought to the brink of a precipice ready to swallow them up, and destroy every department of civilization. These forewarnings arose in the school of the younger Humanists, headed by Erasmus, of Rotterdam. The important questions—who were Erasmus and his companions? what was their character, theology, morals? how did they employ the gifts bestowed on them by the Creator?—these and others less weighty, largely bearing on the history of the Reformation, are for the first time treated by Professor Janssen with a thoroughness and clearness which cannot be too highly eulogized. We become acquainted with the younger Humanists as men mixing up Christian theology with heathen ideas, opposing, therefore, as strongly as possible, the Mediæval theologians, and men whom, although starting from another point, even Luther opposed. The Augustinian monk of Wittenberg, together with Ulrich von Hutten, whose character and writings we forbear to describe, brought about what is styled the Reformation, or rather the ecclesiastical Revolution. Luther's portrait of himself in Janssen's work is well worth reading by Catholic and Protestant alike. A student of medicine having perused this part of the second volume was reported, by the papers, to have said to his father, "If this is the origin of our religion, I cannot remain a Protestant." The third part of the second volume unveils to us the terrible social revolution in Germany, 1522–1525, produced by Luther's treacherous attempts against the Church; the laying in ashes of innumerable convents, libraries, churches, villages; the corruption of morals; the sacrificing of the people's liberty to the encroachments of princes, and the undermining of the existence of the Holy Roman Empire. Benevolence and charity began to disappear so rapidly that Luther wrote, in 1525, "Under the Pope the devil was careful to extend his snares, by erecting convents and schools, and no child could escape without a miracle, but now schools are everywhere pulled down." I conclude by remarking that Henry VIII. of England, very often appears in the expositions of the second volume. The Professor is indefatigably busy in bringing out the following volumes.

Is there not to be found an English Catholic historian who would undertake the translation of Janssen's work?

B.

Poems. By RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin, Chancellor of the Order of St. Patrick. Eighth Edition. Macmillan. 1879.

AMONG the many high gifts of Archbishop Trench, the poet's glory is not wanting; and the compositions which he has given to the world from time to time have been duly appreciated by readers of cultivated minds and keen sympathies. Singing

To one clear harp in divers tones,

his elegiac verses, his story of Justin Martyr, his sonnets, his translations from the Spanish, the Persian, the Turkish, have variously exhibited his true poetic powers, and we hail it as an excellent sign of the public taste that his verses, now collected, have reached an eighth edition. Where there is so much which is very beautiful, and space is limited, the task of quotation is difficult. But the following rendering of a passage of St. Augustine, which we select chiefly because of its brevity, is no unworthy specimen of the author's muse.

A Passage from St. Augustine.

Wert thou a wanderer on a foreign strand,
Who yet couldst only in thy native land
Find peace, or joy, or any blessed thing—
And, thy sore travail to an end to bring,
Shouldst thither now determine to return,
Since in all other places doomed to mourn—
But having need of carriages for this,
To bring thee to thy country and true bliss,
What if the pleasant motion which they made,
With the fair prospects on each side displayed,
Should so attract thee, thou at last wert fain,
The things, for use lent only, to retain;
Entangled so with their perverse delight,
That from thy country alienated quite,
And its true joys whereto thou first didst tend,
And loathing to approach thy journey's end,
Thou shouldst be now the pilgrim, with the fear
Lest thy long pilgrimage's close were near—
If this way it fared with thee, we might say,
Thou didst man's life unto the life portray.

The Life or Legend of Gaudama, the Buddha of the Burmese. By the Right Reverend P. BIGANDET, Bishop of Ramatha, Vicar Apostolic of Ava and Pegu. In Two Volumes. Trübner. 1880.

THIS work is one of the greatest authorities upon Buddhism. The venerable author, who for many years has held the office of Vicar-Apostolic of Ava and Pegu, from the first deemed it part of his duty to make himself as thoroughly acquainted as he could with the religion of the people among whom he was called to labour; not an easy matter, when even of its professed teachers the bulk are very ill-versed in it. No difficulty, however, sufficed to deter Bishop Bigandet from the task he had undertaken, and in the work before us he has published to the world the result of his researches. It consists, mainly, of a translation from the Burmese of the history of the great founder of the Buddhist religion, accompanied by copious annotations of great erudition and suggestiveness from the Bishop's own pen. This fills the whole of the first and half of the second volume, the remainder of which is occupied by abstracts of a few Burmese Dzats or legends, remarks on the typography of the legend of Buddha, a dissertation on the seven ways to Neibban, the Burmese equivalent of

the Sanskrit Nirvana (which holds the same place in the Buddhist system as the Beatific Vision does in the Catholic religion), and an account of the Phongyies or Burmese monks. The extreme value of Bishop Bigandet's work has been fully recognized by all competent scholars, whether English, French, or German. There can be no doubt that the picture it places before us of Gaudama is, upon the whole, the most veracious at present attainable; the Bishop's translation is made from a Burmese version, executed rather more than a century ago, of a Pali work called Malla-linkara Wootto. The date of the Pali original cannot with certainty be fixed, but unquestionably it is of very high antiquity; probably not much later than the fifth century of our era, when Buddhism was introduced into Burmah from Ceylon. There is, of course, much legendary matter in it; but through the mist of fable we can discern, at all events in outline, the original tradition regarding the great teacher who so strangely stirred men's hearts five centuries before the coming of Christ, and whose religion (in Bishop Bigandet's words) "false as it is, deserves to be known and understood, since in point of antiquity it is second to none except to Brahminism, and as regards diffusion extends its sway probably over one-fifth of the human race" (vol. ii. p. 151, note).

The Life of King Alfred the Great. By ARTHUR GEORGE KNIGHT, S.J.
(Quarterly Series.) London: Burns and Oates. 1880.

THIS volume, the contents of which have already in great part appeared in the *Month*, is a new, original, and most ably-written life and history of King Alfred. Its research is exhaustive, its literary form excellent, and its interest very great. A life of the great English king requires a writer with three qualifications—first, he must be able to distinguish chronicle from chronicle, authority from authority; next, he must have an intimate acquaintance with the geography of Somerset and Wilts; and, thirdly, he must be able to frame a narrative which shall not read too prosaic or too tame, even in competition with the *mythus* which has grown up round Alfred's name. F. Knight's very acceptable contribution to original Catholic literature well satisfies all these conditions. The most exciting portion of his narrative—the description of the Battle of Ethandune and of the romantic events which preceded it—has very much gained in interest by its following Bishop Clifford's masterly archæological Paper, contributed to the proceedings of the Somersetshire Archæological Society, entitled "An Inquiry concerning the Real Site of the Battle of Ethandune." But the whole work shows minute familiarity with the best sources, both ancient and modern. No more acceptable present could be made to a boy than this "Life of King Alfred."

Eutropia: or How to Find a Way Out of Darkness and Doubt into Light and Certainty. By the Rev. Father PIUS DEVINE, Passionist. London: Burns and Oates. 1880.

IN his admirable little volume "The Priest on the Mission," Canon Oakeley wrote, ten years ago:—"The great accession of converts to the Catholic Church during the last quarter of a century has not only added to the labours of the missionary or parochial priest, but has gone to form quite a new department of priestly duty." "Eutropia" is, however, so far as we know, the first attempt that has been made to supply a young priest with advice and guidance in this special department of duty. The duty is a difficult one, because, as the author reminds us in his preface, it is difficult, at first, to apply dogmatic theology at once to each particular case as it occurs. Further, "surprise is apt to meet a young priest in his first contact with living and breathing error;" doctrines that had been proved in the class-books, and difficulties that had there been satisfactorily solved, when we meet them in the concrete, "furnished with a voice, a reasoning peculiarly their own, and a strong adherence on which we did not calculate, become quite formidable." No book can quite supersede these shocks and difficulties of the novice in society, but no greater boon can well be imagined than a good treatise on this branch of pastoral work, which will help the application of dogmatic lessons, and lend the young priest the use of that wisdom which has been gained by years of experience. This is what the author of "Eutropia" proposes to do. In a series of chapters he traces the different ways in which the grace of conversion may come to a soul; then he treats of the various systems of religious error which converts leave; some miscellaneous doubts are dealt with in the third place; and finally a few chapters treat of the care of the newly-received, and the dangers they are exposed to. This latter portion of the book contains some sagacious observations and very useful hints—indeed, in our judgment, the author is happier in didactic than either in argumentative or descriptive writing. In the last-named, however, there is a certain exaggeration of detail and of style with vigorous epithet that suggests satire, and which many will prefer to more polished and correct writing.

The Faith of our Fathers: being a Plain Exposition and Vindication of the Church founded by our Lord Jesus Christ. By the Most Rev. J. GIBBONS, D.D., Archbishop of Baltimore. Fifteenth carefully-revised and enlarged edition. Baltimore: John Murphy and Co. 1880.

"THE Faith of Our Fathers," which is a volume of 480 pages, has had an unprecedented sale in America, not less than 80,000 copies of it having been bought up. It stands, therefore, as the most popular exposition of the Catholic faith published in modern days. The secret of its success appears to be contained in its being thoroughly actual—that is to say, brought close up to the reason and thoughts of

men of the present day. It is written in a plain and pleasing style, and is homely in its explanations. One of the most beautiful chapters is on the Blessed Virgin, a subject of special difficulty to Protestants, and it is handled in a way eminently likely to smooth away Protestant prejudice. His Grace has brought great learning and research to bear upon his labours, but he has known how to conceal the appearance of erudition and learning under forms which are easy and agreeable. We cannot but desire that a work which is rendering such eminent service in America should become widely known in England.

An Exposition of the Gospel of St. Luke. By the Most Rev. Dr. MAC-EVILLY, Bishop of Galway. Dublin: M. H. Gill and Son. 1879.

WE rejoice to see that the learned prelate has found time amidst the arduous and numerous duties of his episcopate to bring out another volume of his Gospel exposition. We trust that he may be spared to complete his labours on the New Testament by explaining St. John and the Acts. A thoroughly orthodox Scripture commentary in English will be a great boon to Catholics. It will enable them the better to defend their faith and to advance their own spiritual profit. And it is the more welcome at this time when so much interest is excited in Scriptural questions by Protestant commentaries and textual revisions. Such a work as the Bishop of Galway's will show Protestants that Catholics are not behindhand in Scriptural knowledge, nor are our bishops obscurantists. One special charm of this work is that there is no parade of learning, none of that pedantic affectation so frequently visible in other commentaries. Great learning is concealed by greater modesty, and wide reading by a sweet simplicity. There is milk for the babes, and strong meat for the perfect. Another advantage lies in the authoritative character derived from the exalted position of the writer. This is rather felt than asserted. One cannot help wishing that the bishop would tell us his own opinion on some vexed questions more frequently than he does. Yet when the defence of the faith requires it, he speaks out very fully and clearly, as for instance, in his explanation of our Lord's prayer for St. Peter that "his faith fail not" (Luke xxii. 32), the full force of the words is brought out in their bearing on Papal infallibility. St. Luke's Gospel of the Nativity, derived as it probably is from the Queen of Evangelists, is set forth in a commentary inspired by the deepest theology and the warmest piety. We feel sure that Catholic readers will show their appreciation for this volume as unmistakably as they have for the previous volume which the bishop has sent forth.

The Religious Mission of the Irish People and Catholic Colonization. By J. L. SPALDING, D.D., Bishop of Peoria. New York: Catholic Publication Society. 1880.

THIS admirable little book deserves to be read by English Catholics because it deals, and deals eloquently, with the spread of our faith in the English-speaking portion of the New World. The mission

of the Irish people, we need scarcely say, is to carry that faith wherever Englishmen have established colonies.

Whoever, (says the author), at the beginning of the present century had considered the state of religion in Great Britain and Ireland, would have had no difficulty in pronouncing, at least, upon one point. He would have felt certain that, whatever might come to pass, there was beyond all question no future for Catholicism in those islands. And if no future there, then no future in North America, in Australia, in half the world. And so it seemed that the English-speaking portion of the human race whose share in moulding the future of the world is to counterbalance that of all others, was irrevocably dedicated to the cause of Protestantism. . . . The century is not near its close, and yet since its opening the cause of Catholicism has undergone a transformation little less than marvellous in the whole English-speaking world.

The changes and progress of religion in the States of America are what chiefly concerns the author. "At the breaking out of the War of Independence there were not more than 25,000 Catholics in a population of three millions." They had few priests, no bishops, no schools, no religious houses. Moreover, the "thirteen American colonies which declared their independence were intensely and thoroughly Protestant." Indeed, bigotry and hatred of Catholics was fresher and more active here than in the mother country at the same date. The Catholic Church is at this moment co-extensive with the country, "its members are counted by millions, its priests and sacred edifices by thousands. Its archbishops and bishops rule over eleven metropolitan and fifty-four suffragan sees." Everywhere are convents and colleges and schools. "The Irish race is the providential instrument through which God has wrought this marvellous revival." This is not all: "there are many reasons for thinking that no other religion is so sure of a future here as the Catholic." The reader ought to go to the book itself for details of these *gesta Dei per Hibernos*. That practical portion of the volume which falls under the second half of its title not only ought to be read of every priest in Ireland, but imparted somehow to the mass of the people wherever there are intending emigrants.

We must content ourselves, here, to have said this word of welcome to the Bishop of Peoria's interesting volume; we hope in an early article to return to the consideration of it more at the leisure and length it deserves.

A Sketch of the Life and Mission of St. Benedict. By a Monk of St. Gregory's Priory, Downside. London: John Hodges. 1880.

The Medal and Cross of St. Benedict. From the French of Abbot GUÉRANGER. Translated by a Monk of the English Benedictine Congregation. London: Burns and Oates. 1880.

THESE books, more especially the first, are connected with the great centenary celebration of the birth of St. Benedict, which has just taken place over the whole Western Church. The "Sketch" is a most readable and useful account of the Life and Rule of the Holy

Patriarch, together with an excellently-done history of the spread of the Benedictine Order and of the Apostolate of the Benedictines in England. Perhaps more might have been made of Pope St. Gregory's letters to St. Augustine, and the learned and skilful writer might have dwelt more distinctly on that most interesting feature in the history of the English Benedictines—their establishment by Pope Gregory the Great as a missionary, and even parochial congregation—then a novelty in the Church—and their confirmation and re-establishment as such by at least two other Popes before the Norman Conquest. But considerations of space, no doubt, prevented this.

This new translation of Dom Guéranger's well-known tract on the Medal or Cross of St. Benedict, is well done and beautifully got up. It contains one or two photographic illustrations, and also fine reproductions of the new Monte Cassino Centenary Medal, and the Centenary Cross of the English Benedictines.

Anglican Jurisdiction: Is it Valid? By J. D. BREEN, O.S.B. London: Burns and Oates. 1880.

THIS is a brochure of not quite one hundred pages, but we have read few contributions to the question which convey more information or give better arguments. Father Breen shows, by excellently chosen extracts and citations, first, that the Early Church acknowledged the Papal See as the source of "Jurisdiction;" secondly, that our own English Church, from its commencement, down to the change of religion, did the same; and lastly, that the Anglican theory is, officially, that the source of jurisdiction is the Crown. The question of jurisdiction has not yet occasioned quite so much stir as that of Orders among our Anglican friends, but it is beginning to assert itself. Father Breen's book is most opportune. Let Anglicans look at their Church as it is, not as they evolve it from their own consciousness. Three delicious citations given by the author, one from the "judicious" Hooker, another from Bishop Horsley, and a third from Bishop Van Mildert—neither passages well-known—will materially assist them in this process.

BOOKS OF DEVOTION AND SPIRITUAL READING.

1. *The Little Oremus. A Liturgical Prayer Book.* London: Washbourne. 1879.
2. *St. Joseph's Manual of a Happy Eternity.* By FATHER SEBASTIAN, of the Blessed Sacrament. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1879.
3. *Visits to Jesus on the Altar.* By the Author of "Reflections and Prayers for Holy Communion." Translated from the French. Vol. I. London: Burns & Oates. 1879.
4. *Daily Bread: being Morning Meditations for a Year.* By the late Rev. RICHARD WALDO SIETHORP. London: Bemrose & Sons. 1879.

5. *The Manna of the Soul. Meditations for every Day of the Year.* By FATHER PAUL SEGNERI. (Translation.) Vol. IV. London: Burns & Oates. 1879.
6. *La Dévotion au Sacré Cœur de Jésus.* Par le R. P. SCHMUDE, S.J. Traduit de l'Allemande par le R. P. MAZOYER. Paris: Pous-sielgue. 1878.
7. *Moral Discourses.* By the Rev. PATRICK O'KEEFFE. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1879.
8. *How to Live Piously.* By the Rev. THOMAS MURPHY. Dublin: Duffy & Sons. 1879.
9. *Meditations and Contemplations on the Sacred Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ.* Translated from the Spanish of the Ven. LUIS of Granada, O.P. By a Member of the Order of Mercy. New York: The Catholic Publication Society. 1879.
10. *Miniature Life of Mary, Virgin and Mother, for every day of the Month.* Compiled by HENRY SEBASTIAN BOWDEN, of the Oratory. London: Burns & Oates. 1880.
11. *The Pilgrim's May-Wreath.* By the Rev. FATHER THADDEUS, O.S.F. London: Burns & Oates. 1880.
12. *The Holy Ghost the Sanctifier.* (Little Books of the Holy Ghost, No. 4.) By HENRY EDWARD, Cardinal-Archbishop of Westminster. London: Burns and Oates. 1880.
13. *Emmanuel; a Book of Eucharistic Verses.* By the Rev. MATTHEW RUSSELL, S.J. Fifth Edition. Dublin: Gill and Son. 1880.
14. *Madonna: Verses on our Lady and the Saints.* By the Rev. MATTHEW RUSSELL. Dublin: Gill and Son. 1880.
15. *Mary's Call to her loving Children.* (Our Lady's Library.) London: Richardson and Son.
16. *The Raccolta, or Collection of Indulgenced Prayers.* By AMEROSE ST. JOHN. Authorized Translation. Fifth Edition. London: Burns and Oates. 1880.
17. *Solid Virtue.* By the Rev. FATHER BELLECIUS, S.J. Translated by a Member of the Ursuline Community, Thurles. Dublin: Gill and Son. 1879.
18. *The Life and Miracles of St. Benedict.* By ST. GREGORY THE GREAT. From an old English Version by P. W. (Paris: 1608). Edited by DOM EDMUND J. LUCK, O.S.B. London: Washbourne. 1880.

1. *The Little Oremus* is a "liturgical" prayer-book, and those who know the larger work from which it is compiled will be prepared to find considerable transcriptions from the Breviary and the Ordinary of the Mass. It is truly an admirable little manual of Catholic prayer, full of devotion and solidity, and without a line of nonsense or mawkish sentiment.

2. Those who have made the acquaintance of Father Sebastian's former manuals will be prepared to welcome *St. Joseph's Manual of a Happy Eternity*. It is compiled primarily for the brethren of the Association of the Bona Mors, and therefore a large part of the book, amounting to a third, is taken up with the Mass and Office of the Dead, and various prayers. The other two-thirds consist of a number of pious and fervent considerations in preparation for death. We observe that the Latin text and citations are not free from misprints. The book carries the *imprimatur* of the Archbishop of Dublin.

3. These *Visits*, translated from the French by an anonymous translator, are apparently translated very well. Any one in search of a new and attractive work of the kind, either for private devotion or to give away, might do worse than send for this one.

4. *The Daily Bread* of the late Rev. Father Richard Waldo Sibthorp derives a peculiar interest from the fact that its author died, at the great age of eighty-six, whilst it was passing through the press. Father Sibthorp's career was not an important one, except to himself, and his temporary lapse from Catholicism, though it grieved many, caused little harm to the Faith at large. He was a man of some power, and of some eccentricity. Like many original men, he could not do himself justice in print; perhaps because bright ideas are of little use without both artistic power to frame and environ them, and also patient labour to carry them through. Father Sibthorp, however, could labour. The present work, written in extreme old age, under the constant attacks of painful and wearing illness, is a proof of this. Readers will not perhaps find these lucubrations either very devotional or very striking. They are the thoughts of a man well-informed, well read in Holy Scripture, shrewd and sensible. But they have that fatal vagueness on such subjects as grace, the interior life and Christian perfection, which distinguishes the spiritual treatises of Protestants. Those, however, who knew the author will treasure them, and the excellently done biographical introduction, as a memorial of a friend.

5. We content ourselves with drawing attention to the fourth and concluding volume of the English translation of Segneri's "*Manna dell' anima*," and congratulate the translator, whoever he may be, on the completion of what appears to be a most genuine and readable version of a book which is equally remarkable for its wealth of divinity and its classic literary form.

6. The French translation of the work of Father Schmude on the Sacred Heart of Jesus is a small but valuable addition to books of devotion. The biographical details in relation to the Blessed Margaret Mary, with considerable extracts from her own forms of prayer, seem admirably adapted for giving the pious reader the genuine spirit of the devotion. Father Schmude's own chapters on the love and sufferings of our Lord are moulded upon the Exercises of St. Ignatius, and, therefore, not a line is vapid or superfluous. It would have been well if the author had tried to present our Lord's sufferings in a more winning light. There seems to us too much stress laid on the theory of "substitution," not at all in any way that is the least unorthodox,

but to the exclusion of what seems to us a most true philosophy of the Passion—viz., the view that suffering was accepted to intensify the love and worship of the Sacred Heart. We should also have been glad of some notes on the genuine and veritable way to represent in painting and sculpture that Sacred Heart which Blessed Margaret Mary was given to see. The book is a little carelessly edited. St. Gertrude of Eisleben was not the sister of St. Mechtildis; and St. Francis of Sales did not die in 1625.

7. The Rev. Father O'Keeffe's *Moral Discourses* will be found useful for spiritual reading, and also as "aids" to the clergy; for they are full of Scripture, well-arranged and to the point, whilst their language, though plain, is dignified and eloquent. They range over the principal topics of what is called the Via Purgativa. There are a few sermons which have special references to abuses, or evil habits prevalent in Ireland. Father O'Keeffe is well advised in laying it down emphatically that the "pledge" of abstinence is not a vow, but a serious resolution made to a priest (p. 186). The author seems well acquainted with the standard writers, whom he reproduces without servility or direct quotation.

8. The Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin has given his *imprimatur* to an extremely useful little manual which is intended to teach plain people *How to Live Piously*; to keep them regular and fervent in the practice of daily prayer, and of Mass, in the use of the Sacraments, and in the observance of the law of God. Father Murphy, of Mountmellick, an experienced parish priest, has arranged, in some fifty brief instructions, practical and easy methods of every Christian duty. The work is enriched with numerous forms of prayer, and is altogether one that we should be glad to see in use in every Christian family.

9. The translator of these *Meditations* from Luis of Granada has made very free with her author. We are not acquainted with either of the two modern Paris editions which she says she has used; but it is somewhat difficult to follow her in the Madrid edition of 1756. She omits in one place, and inserts new matter in another, whilst there is here and there an awkwardness in the English, which seems to betray a French origin. Still, having made this protest from a literary point of view—for Granada is a Spanish classic—let us add that the little volume will be found to provide a large amount of most devout consideration and prayer on the Passion of our Lord. Useful instructions in meditation, likewise drawn from Granada, are prefixed; and the translation is fairly good.

10. A little book which contains a Life of the Blessed Virgin divided into thirty-one sections, on the model of the "Miniature Lives of the Saints," will be welcome to many. Father Sebastian Bowden has compiled it in the pious and practical spirit which is familiar to those who know the former work.

11. The Franciscan Father who has composed the "Pilgrim's May-Wreath" has carried out with fair success a very happy idea. For each day of the month he has given the story of some celebrated English shrine or sanctuary of the Blessed Virgin. Those sanctuaries

are now deserted, and those shrines have well-nigh disappeared; but it is not only touching, but also stimulating to faith and piety, to read how, in every corner of the England of bygone days, wonders had been vouchsafed in answer to prayer, and splendid monuments of piety had commemorated them. The stories are taken from well-known and obvious sources—(why, by the way, does the author insist on abbreviating, past recognition, the titles of the works he quotes?)—but there are no glaring mistakes. Besides the story, each “day” of the month presents us with a “consideration” on one of our Lady’s virtues, and an “example”—the latter not always of the most authentic.

12. Of Cardinal Manning’s most charming and useful little volume on the Holy Spirit, we need only say that it contains in a short compass, and with admirable perfection of literary expression, a complete course of practical divinity and exhortation on the Third Person of the Most Holy Trinity. It is a work which will be found indispensable to preachers, retreat-givers, and devout readers alike. Special attention may be directed to the “Prayers” at the end of each section; prayers in which each word means something and each clause is in its place and sequence, and in which is to be experienced that subtle rhythmical feeling which is never absent from the great liturgical prayers, but which none but a master of language can impart.

13, 14. These are two books of pleasing devotional verse by a Jesuit Father, a nephew of the late Dr. Russell, of Maynooth. They will be found valuable for devout reading and for recitation. Their literary power is considerable.

15. *Mary’s Call* is a little book approved and strongly recommended by the Bishop of Nottingham. It forms part of a series of books of devotion, written or edited by the Sisters of the Convent of the Maternal Heart of Mary at Nottingham, called “Our Lady’s Library.” The present volume, whilst putting before the reader the usual considerations connected with our Blessed Lady and the practice of Christian virtue, is intended to promote prayer for the dying.

16. This new and beautifully-arranged edition of Father Ambrose St. John’s translation of the *Raccolta* has been made conformable, by additions and corrections, to the latest Roman edition (Propaganda 1877). It is a manual so well known and so necessary in every Catholic household that we need do no more than announce this, the fifth, edition, and remind the reader that the translations here given of the Indulged prayers are “authorized” as equivalent to the originals, by a Rescript of the late Pope, dated February 3, 1856.

17. This translation of the admirable treatise of F. Bellecius, S.J., on *Solid Virtue* deserves a most hearty welcome. There are few books of spiritual reading and direction which are more entirely satisfactory. Hitherto the work has not existed in an English dress. The present version has been made from the French, but a comparison with the original Latin proves that the sense has been well preserved. There is a short but interesting preface by Archbishop Croke:

18. One of the Cassinese Fathers at Ramsgate has thought it well to reprint that portion of the old English translation of the “Dialogues
VOL. XXXV. NO. I. [*Third Series.*] R

of St. Gregory" which contains the life of the holy patriarch St. Benedict. The little volume is excellently printed and got up, and will be welcome to the many clients of St. Benedict, who are celebrating with special devotion the present year.

BOOKS FOR CHILDREN.

1. *African Pets, or Chats about our Animal Friends in Natal : with a Sketch of Kaffir Life.* Second Thousand. By F. CLINTON PARRY. London : Griffith and Farran. 1880.
2. *Ways and Tricks of Animals ; with Stories about Aunt Mary's Pets.* By MARY HOOPER. London. (Same publishers.)
3. *Christian Elliot ; or, Mrs. Danver's Prize.* By L. N. COMYN. Fifth Thousand. London. (Same publishers.)
4. *Wrecked, not Lost ; or, the Pilot and his Companions.* By the Hon. MRS. DUNDAS. Sixth Thousand. London. (Same publishers.)
5. *Among the Brigands, and other Tales of Adventure.* By C. E. BOWEN. Fourth Thousand. London. (Same publishers.)

WE have examined these volumes that we might be able to pronounce on their suitability for Catholic children : and they have stood the test very satisfactorily ; there is nothing in them objectionable on the subject of religion, and they are all, each in its own way, very interesting in the style that is attractive to juvenile minds. There is so much being talked about Africa just now among their elders that young people are sure to be attracted by the title of "African Pets;" and the book will be a great favourite wherever it is read. The stories about the animal pets which the authoress made during her residence in Natal are well told, and gain an interest from her assurance that they are all true. And from the "Sketch of Kaffir Life" children will learn a great deal more about it than most fathers and mothers know. The "Sketch" is written in a good tone and is full of information. The Zulus are said to be the most intelligent and best looking of the Kaffir tribes ; their kraals a "picture of neatness." We are told how they live, dress, what they eat and do ; we learn what a "drift" in Kaffirland is, that Cetewayo's name is pronounced as if written *Ketch-y-o*, and much besides that will be very interesting to English boys and girls.

"Ways and Tricks of Animals" appeals to a more juvenile audience than the other books and will be prized as much for its capital pictures as for the illustrative stories. Of the three remaining stories, "Wrecked not Lost," and "Among the Brigands," are full of adventure and marvellous escapes, just of the sort that will hold boys spellbound. But "Christian Elliott" is a charming story of an incident in the quiet lives of a brother and sister ; the boy's character, sayings and doings are especially true to life. His flight and early death, too, are well told, and by their natural pathos help to enforce a good moral lesson which is nowhere "preached," but told in a manner that children will see and feel by the incidents of the story itself.